DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 718 SO 016 493

TITLE	Political Science's Responsibility to the Community: A Promise Fulfilled? Anniversary Sessions of the Department of Political Science, University of Illinois (75th, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, November 20-21, 1981). The Edmund James James Lecture.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Political Science.
PUB DATE	84
NOTE	116p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational History; Government (Administrative Body); Government Employees; Higher Education; *Intellectual Disciplines; International Relations; *Political Science; Public Administration Education; Public Agencies; Public Service Occupations; *Responsibility; *School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	Institutional History; *Public Service

ABSTRACT

This report contains the keynote speech, the panel discussions, and questions (with responses) from the audience for each of two major sessions on the responsibility of political science to the community. The focus of the first session was academic political science and public service. The keynote speaker was William N. Cassella. Panelists were Louis R. Pondy, Clark W. Bullard, and James D. Nowlan. In the second session, the major topic was academia and international relations and the usefulness of the discipline of political science to government service. The keynote speaker was Wei-ping Tsai. Panelists were Dina A. Zinnes, Werner Baer, George T. Yu, and Richard L. Merritt. The report concludes with two interviews--one with Clarence A. Berdahl, the second with Neil Garvey--concerning the history of the political science department of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. A history of the public administration program at the university, presented by Thomas Page, is also provided. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257718

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Political Science's Responsibility to the Community:

A Promise Fulfilled?

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Roger E. Kanet

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP016193

Political Science's Responsibility to the Community:

A Promise Fulfilled?

The Edmund Janes James Lecture

Seventy-fifth Anniversary Sessions of
the Department of Political Science
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign
held Friday and Saturday, November
20 and 21, 1981

3

Issued by the
Department of Political Science
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, Illinois

Copyright 1984
Department of Political Science

Table of Contents

Friday, November 20, 1981 3:00-5:00 P.M.
"Academic Political Science and Public Service"

William N. Cassella
Executive Director, National Municipal League, keynote speaker 6

Panel Discussion

Louis R. Pondy, Head, Department of Business Administration 16

Clark W. Bullard, Director, Office of Energy Research and Associate Professor, Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering 19

James D. Nowlan, Director, Masters in Public Administration Program 23

Questions and Discussion from the Audience 26

Saturday, November 21, 1981 9:30 A.M. – 12:00 N.
"The Academy and International Relations"

Wei-ping Tsai
Chief, Coordination Council for North American Affairs, Republic of China (Taiwan), keynote speaker 31

Questions and Discussion from the Audience 35

Panel Discussion

Dina A. Zinnes, Merriam Professor, Department of Political Science ... 38

Werner Baer, Professor, Department of Economics 39

George T. Yu, Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Political Science 41

Richard L. Merritt, Professor and Head, Department of Political Science 43

Concluding Remarks 46

History of the Department of Political Science
Interview with Clarence A. Berdahl 48

History of the Department of Political Science
Interview with Neil Garvey 94

History of the M.A.P.A. Program
by Thomas Page 105

Friday Afternoon Session

Samuel K. Gove

I am delighted to open this session of the Diamond Jubilee of the Department of Political Science at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. I think you all know what the program is: We're organized under the general title "Political Science's Responsibility to the Community: A Promise Fulfilled?" Between the sessions this afternoon, this evening and tomorrow, you'll probably hear a little more about the history of the Department and a little reminiscing. I'm a new boy in the Department. I've been on campus only thirty years, and so I don't know all the history.

Our keynote speaker this afternoon will be followed by a panel discussion which may involve two or three or four people, depending on the airplanes. Even I might feel moved to say something profound, which is unlikely. In order to keep the others honest, two of the panelists do not come from political science and they may not have the true faith.

Our first session is on the theme "Academic Political Science and Public Service." We are delighted to have as our keynote speaker a graduate of the University and an old friend of mine, William Cassella. Bill Cassella was born in Alton, Illinois and graduated from this campus in 1942. He got a master's degree at Syracuse and Harvard and his Ph.D. at Harvard in 1953. He has taught political science at the University of Missouri and has been with the National Municipal League since 1953, acting as executive director since 1969. I probably should say that the National Municipal League is not affiliated with the Illinois Municipal League; it is a citizens' reform organization. I think we may hear a little about that during Bill Cassella's remarks. Bill brings considerable public service to his topic of academic political science and public service. I could go on at some length about his record but to mention just a few of his activities, he has served on several state advisory commissions, was a member of the Greenburg, New York, Board of Education, and has been an active member of the Westchester County Planning Board since 1962. He has served as vice chairman of the last group since 1967. He has written extensively on the constitutional aspects of metropolitan government. He is the editor of the *National Civic Review* and has been chairman of the editorial board since 1969. It is a real pleasure for me to introduce an alumnus of this Department and an old friend, Bill Cassella.

William N. Cassella

"Political Science's Responsibility to the Community: A Promise Fulfilled?"

My thanks to Professor Merritt and his colleagues for inviting me to participate in this convocation. I am honored and particularly pleased to be here. It is gratifying professionally, but also for me this is a sentimental journey. As I thought about what I might contribute to these discussions, my mind's eye saw a whole procession of personalities and events which occurred in the years I was here on campus from September 1938 to June 1942 as an undergraduate political science major. It would be a most pleasant, nostalgic exercise for me to present a memoir of those years, but that is not my assignment. I shall, however, in speaking about the responsibility of academic political science mention some personalities who as teachers and practitioners provide examples of how "promise" does approach "fulfillment."

As one whose role for the last quarter century has been to tend the bridge between the halls of academe and those of government and civic action, my perspective is somewhat different from that of the professional scholar, politician or public servant. Or, putting it another way, it is the perspective of the involved citizen. We, as citizens, are dependent upon the academy for the training, guidance and understanding necessary for us to fulfill the responsibilities of citizenship. These roles and responsibilities are many and varied. Academic political science has served the community well as it prepares citizens for some of these roles. For others the record is uneven.

Political scientists have had a major part in bringing government administration from the realm of transient amateurs and political spoils to one characterized by ever-increasing professional competence. In no aspect of government has the change been more dramatic than at the local level. It was less than a decade before this Department was established that Lord James Bryce in *American Commonwealth* made his famous indictment of American cities:

> There is no denying that the government of cities is one conspicuous failure of the United States. The deficiencies of the National Government tell but little for evil or the welfare of the people. The faults of State government are insignificant compared with the extravagance, corruption, and mismanagement which mark the administration of most of the great cities.[1]

---

[1] James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth* (abridged edition, 1900), p. 422; (new edition, 1920), I, p. 642.

It was during the la[illegible] years of the nineteenth century and t[illegible] first part of the twentieth that a number of political scientists, civic activists, and reform-minded politicians like Theodore Roosevelt began to address the "conspicuous failure" of our city governments. Among the political scientists was Edmund Janes James, then at the University of Pennsylvania, and later president of the University of Illinois (1904-1919). Since 1938, he has been honored by the James series of lectures on government at the University of Illinois. Professor James was one of the founders of the National Municipal League in 1894, and three years later he presented a paper which was of strategic importance to the reform of city government. It was titled "The Elements of a Model Charter for American Cities." It should also be noted that in those days Woodrow Wilson was among the academics. As a young college teacher in 1887, he prepared a paper which is reputed to have formally launched the academic study of public administration "to straighten the path of government, to make its business less unbusinesslike, to strengthen and purify its organization, and to crown its duties with dutifulness." While president of Princeton University he founded the National Short Ballot Organization. Also among the young academics who participated in the early moves to set the course of municipal reform was John A. Fairlie, who wrote in 1901 the first textbook in municipal administration:

> We have noted the growth of urban population and the development of city government in the United States from the petty colonial boroughs of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to the vast metropolitan municipalities of today. We have seen the evolution from the simple and unorganized council government to the complicated administrative machinery of municipal departments. In the process the central direction of municipal affairs has passed from the council, and in most American cities authority is distributed and dissipated on no fixed principle among council, mayor, and state legislature, while the influence of national and state political contests in municipal elections, and the operation of the spoils system in municipal office-holding, have served to deteriorate still further municipal administration. In recent years, however, we see certain tendencies toward a more scientific distribution of authority, toward the separation of municipal from national and state elections, and toward a more efficient and permanent subordinate service; and although these tendencies have not as yet become widespread, yet it is along the lines already indicated that further advances of a permanent nature may be most rationally anticipated.[2]

---

[2] John A. Fairlie, *Municipal Administration* (Macmillan), p. 102.

Professor Fairlie, President James, and other political scientists were key participants in providing the early municipal reform movement, notably the models developed by the National Municipal League, with the intellectual content which has accounted in large part for its widespread acceptance. It was grounded in an understanding of American political experience and the complexities of the law of state/local relationships. Although it partook of the doctrines of scientific management, its leaders understood the essentials of democratic theory as well.

Fairlie and others also pioneered in developing training programs for the municipal service. Unquestionably, the concurrence of the concerted efforts to restructure government, the private municipal research movement and the professionalization of the municipal service had a fundamental impact upon American politics. It was responsible for transforming the government of cities to something which is a far cry from the condition described by Lord Bryce at the turn of the century. The part academic political scientists played in bringing this about has been monumental. Citizens who have chosen to assume professional roles in government certainly have been well served.

Public servants thoroughly grounded in political philosophy and an understanding of the basics of constitutional law have a special contribution to make to the operations of American federalism—at all governmental levels and in international administration as well. Their insights provide a counter to the narrow vision of so many public service professionals in countless specialties—from social work to nuclear science. As generalists they can provide the intellectual cement which keeps the system from falling apart, and no one can deny it has faced and will face many jolts, some of titanic force. A continuing concern, however, is that even our generalists in the public service fail to recognize that in a democratic polity a special relationship exists between the professional and lay elements. Is a deficiency in the programs of education for the public service in part responsible for public disillusionment with the performance of government? Has arrogance become a corollary of a professionalized public service? Perhaps so, but the public administrators well schooled in democratic theory are less likely to be the arrogant unresponsive bureaucrats. Their training equips them to intervene and force the "vertical functional autocracies" to be more sensitive to the general well-being of the community. In municipal government, the community has been well served by the city management profession, the generalists of local government. This undoubtedly is due in large measure to the fact that both in theory and practice managers are continuously responsible to the lay element in local governance, the elected representatives of the public. Significantly, in the statement accompanying the National Municipal League's endorsement of

the council-manager plan more than sixty years ago, political scientist A. Lawrence Lowell, then president of Harvard University, said:

> . . . In every form of administration, and especially in a democracy, both expert and lay elements are indispensable for the best results; the expert for his knowledge of the most effective means of attaining the results desired; the layman to keep the expert in touch with public opinion, to preserve him from falling into ruts, to prevent the trees from obscuring his view of the forest. . . . They are two parts of the same mechanism. . . . In a sense, they take part jointly in every act performed. On everything that is done the expert should be consulted, and every act, however minute, technical, or in the nature of routine, should be done with the approval, express or implied, of the lay controlling body which must assume to the public the responsibility therefor. The lay body must never cast the blame upon the expert. If convinced that he is unfit for his position it may remove him, for permanence does not mean incompetence in office. But a removal must only mean a search for a better man to hold permanently by a tenure dependent only upon his professional work. The expert, on the other hand, must realize that he is not the ultimate authority, that everything which ought in his opinion to be done cannot be accomplished, that he has a double function, the conduct of current administration, and persuading the representatives of the public so far as he can that his plans are wise.[3]

Although some academic political scientists may have been reluctant participants in programs for training public service professionals, I believe that, in doing so, political science has served the community well, that it can speak of a promise being fulfilled. Those who enter careers in the public service, or in elective politics for that matter, are but a small minority of citizens. How well does political science serve the vast majority of us who are filling the many "lay" roles in our system of self-government? Certainly some of us have been extremely well served by great teachers and by the examples of scholars who themselves have applied their talents in important public roles.

I am sure that for many others the experience of Charles Kneier's lectures in municipal government held in the Lincoln Hall Theatre are as unforgettable as they are for me. He made local government come alive in the minds of his students, many of whom were not political science majors. Just back on campus after a leave of absence in Springfield to set up the Illinois Legislative Council, he gave meaning to the tricky concepts of state/local relations. He made us see that as citizens we had a part in it.

---

[3] National Muncipal League, *A New Municipal Program* (1919), p.37ff.

Perhaps when I was an undergraduate, the times were partly responsible for the interest many of us had in our roles as citizens. All of us faced public service, voluntarily or involuntarily, in World War II. We were looking beyond military service to other kinds of service in a system then under attack. There was almost universal agreement that the system had to be preserved and a widespread feeling that its imperfections must be addressed after we finished the business of fighting a war. To be sure, there was debate on whether or not the U.S. should be involved, and the debate was not just an academic exercise. I remember how my two American government instructors, Harry Mellman and M. W. Sibley, were in disagreement on this question. I remember the high drama of the 1940 mock national party conventions held in the University Auditorium, in which FDR's leadership was the overriding issue. I remember how Clarence Berdahl persuaded a mutual friend and distinguished political science graduate, Irving Dilliard, then editorial page editor of the *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, to reject the prevalent midwest isolationism, and how on the day of Pearl Harbor, I called Val Jobst, whose course in international law I was then taking, to clarify the meaning of the legal concept "state of war." We were all, teachers and students, part of it and after Pearl Harbor there was virtually no anti-war sentiment.

In the political science community and in the university community in general, there was a strong commitment to the fundamental values of our system of self-government—certainly not an uncritical patriotism, but a recognition that the system was threatened by a monumental external force which was on the move. We knew that the system was far from perfect. We had seen it falter during the Great Depression and then revive. Many of us felt that after we were able to meet the Nazi-Fascist challenge we could find solutions to domestic problems. The message of academic political science was that we had an important stake in our political system—had rights and responsibilities—that its imperfections should be our continuing concern, not only as critics, but also as participants in finding and implementing solutions.

Our perceptions were heavily normative, built on the concept that the deficiencies catalogued by Lord Bryce and others could be eliminated by reforms in organization, structure, management and process; that process must provide services and respect constitutional rights, as it imposed regulations to prevent and punish misconduct and disorder and abuses by the private sector. Our commitment was clearly to limited government. We had a high tolerance for the imposition of emergency measures necessitated by depression and war, but saw these extensions of government as distinctly temporary. We wanted to be part of efforts to develop solutions to underlying problems like discrimination, but accepted incremental progress with compromise and accommodations as normal parts of the process. There were

few non-negotiable demands. We were well prepared to deal with the post-World War II decade—with the 1950s—but clearly we were not prepared for what was to come in the 1960s and 1970s. Paradoxically, it has been suggested that we were not prepared to deal with the consequences of our own reforms, that the success of efforts to make government more competent resulted in expectations that government could and should do far more.

Clearly, many citizens had not heard the message that there are limits to the capacity of government, that compromise and accommodation are essential elements in a system of limited government, that service needs are relative, not absolute. Have we in political science failed to convey even a rudimentary understanding of these elements of the American governmental system to the vast majority of our fellow citizens, including the professional specialists who staff the service departments of government at all levels?

I have been struck by the fact that around the turn of the century, when political science had not assumed independent departmental status in most universities, political scientists were stressing the importance of instruction in American governmental institutions at all levels of formal education. In 1903, John Fairlie expressed concern not only for adequate instruction in American government, including states and localities in the courses for advanced students, but also "for the main body of undergraduates . . . it is not too much to say that every college graduate should be enabled to exercise his rights of citizenship with a larger knowledge and broader understanding of their significance . . ."[4]

As the discipline of political science has become well established, it unquestionably has provided a more sophisticated understanding of the behavior of politicians and political institutions. However, there is a serious question as to the extent of its influence on such behavior, particularly in local and state government. Cities, counties and states, as fields of study, were stepchildren of the discipline, except for those who were training public administration professionals. Further, there was a tendency for the profession to be insular and devote but limited energies to communicating insights developed by its research to the practitioners of politics and to undergraduate students. Students in the specialized professions which actually deliver the services of government have seemed too often untouched by those who could have provided them with an understanding of the basics of representative government in America. The splendid isolation and strident absolutism of many functional specialists have been allowed to distort the system. Some call

---

[4] National Municipal League, *Conference on Good City Government* (Detroit/Ann Arbor, April 1903).

them the "vertical functionalautocracies." Certainly political scientists have been aware of this phenomenon, but that awareness has not been reflected conspicuously in the development of academic courses designed to increase understanding of American federalism on the part of those outside the discipline.

Without question, the almost rote-like quality of much early instruction in American government and in the rights and responsibilities of citizenship turned off both teachers and students. "Civics," in a traditional sense, was not a respectable subject of scholarship. It is understandable why scholars wanted to move into more creative fields. Ironically, right at the time when government was becoming more and more central to the lives of all citizens with more programs, more regulations, and most conspicuously, more dollars spent, there seemed to be less, rather than more, attention being paid to the fundamentals of structure and process. State and local governments were becoming major actors in the increasingly intergovernmentalized system, but these pervasive systemic changes seemed to escape academic attention, at least in its outreach beyond the discipline itself.

With the growth of urban studies, attention to the problems of urban governance did increase, but usually detached from the total system. Symptomatic of the problem has been the status of the introductory course in political science. Knowing that this is a matter of concern to many in the profession, I asked the new executive director of the American Political Science Association to recommend to me some recent reports which would bring me up to date. I was astounded by the response I received. It said:

> In 1974-75, the Departmental Services Questionnaire asked chairs to mail APSA the syllabi for their departments' offerings for the course entitled, The Introduction to Political Science. We received 235 syllabi and categorized the substance of these course syllabi as follows:
>
> 33% American Government (by another name)
> 20% the "isms" or modern ideologies
> 20% comparative government
> 10% methodology
>
> The remaining 17% of the syllabi included courses in classical political thought, bibliographies, analytical concepts, and public policy issues. As you can see, our discipline lacks consensus on what constitutes its official introductory course. Indeed, many colleges and universities—40% of our sample—do not offer such a course.

This neglect of a responsibility to provide general understanding of our governmental system comes at a time when many studies confirm that fundamental changes are occurring in American politics. One study suggests

that the conclusion of these studies can be captured in three themes—*political alienation, atomization and overload*.[5] The study saw that

> rising *alienation* is evidenced in the growing suspicion with which political leaders are regarded, as well as declining levels of participation at the ballot box and allegiance to the major political parties. Dramatic changes in the political climate over the past 20 years have brought the nation to what some have described as 'the most severe crisis in civic morale and trust in our history.'[6]
>
> *Atomization* refers to the increasing division of political authority and influence, particularly the rapid increase in the number and strength of special interest lobbies and a concomitant decline in the importance of overarching political institutions: the political parties, the Presidency, and the Congressional leadership. All of these trends, in the view of concerned observers, spell out a weakening of American mass democracy and an undercutting of opportunities for effective participation by the average citizen. . . . .
>
> *Overload* . . . is apparent in both the rising number of decisions and the chorus of demands which confront . . . policymakers. As the sphere of governmental activity has expanded, the growing pressures have nearly overwhelmed every major institution. . . . . As governmental responsibilities grow, so has the belief that government is but tenuously accountable to the public it serves.

The overload permeates the entire system.

Have we as political scientists become too fragmented in our own studies, and in our course offerings? Are we giving adequate attention to the status of American federalism in the 1980s, the decade of the Constitutional Bicentennial? I submit that all of us need to sharpen our own understanding of American federalism. By all of us, I mean professional political scientists, professional public administrators, public officials at all levels, and general citizens.

I said earlier that I felt my academic training in the late 1930s and early 1940s had prepared me to deal with the 1950s, but less so with the 1960s and 1970s. Now, as we deal with the 1980s, we must face some stark realities. The system is in a period of transition. Even the popular press is using the word "federalism" and talking about the present administration's "new federalism," but to most people this whole discussion is equated with federal budget cuts and the move to balance the federal budget. The stress in the system is much more fundamental than that. It has to do with roles and responsibilities of the various levels and the viability of accountable political institutions.

---

[5] U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *The Federal Role in the Federal System: The Dynamics of Growth—Agenda for American Federalism* (1981), p. 82ff.

[6] *National Civic Review* (November 1979), p. 526.

I point to the titles of the three summary volumes in the recent study by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on the federal role in the federal system: *Crisis in Confidence and Competence; The Condition of Contemporary Federalism: Conflicting Theories and Collapsing Constraints*; and finally, *An Agenda for American Federalism Restoring Confidence and Competence*. ACIR warns, "The federal government's influence has become more pervasive, more intrusive, more unmanageable, more ineffective, and above all more unaccountable."

This is not part of the political rhetoric which talks about the bloated federal bureaucracy because ACIR carefully points out that the size of the federal civilian service is almost the same as it was twenty years ago. This is a fact almost entirely ignored in popular media coverage and by many who profess to be authorities on government. The dramatic expansion of the federal role can be attributed to astronomical growth in federal aid to state and local governments: an expansion from seven billion in 1960 to eighty-eight billion in 1980; from thirty-two categorical grants to almost 500; from very few federal regulations on state and local government twenty years ago to 1,259 mandates in 1980. Some rules apply conditions to particular aid programs, some are cross-cutting and apply to all federal grants.

I would number myself among those who initially supported most of the federal grants and most of the specific regulations governing anti-discrimination, environmental controls, citizen participation, etc. It is when all of these grants and regulations are put together that serious problems arise; often the objectives of the original programs, grants and regulations are lost sight of and are sometimes actually impeded by the conditions applied.

Have we as political scientists made an adequate effort to discover how this has come about? Or have we allowed ourselves to be trapped in an ideological dilemma which blinds us to institutional changes because of our personal preferences for particular program objectives? Have we come to grips with the "iron triangle" phenomenon: the public entrepreneur, the erosion of constraints, and the judicial "greenlight"? Do we confuse distributive and redistributive policies and ignore their relationship to equity? Are we sometimes too preoccupied with a desire to develop a comprehensive analysis of the problem before we even try to design solutions? Could it be that we too are overwhelmed by the total system and are more comfortable with looking at discrete parts?

I fear I have departed from my assignment to view academic political science from the perspective of cities and their special needs. Actually their most pressing need is a better understanding of how they fit into the system, their relations with the states and the federal government, how they can determine what they should do and what they should not do. Political science

can provide this understanding if it makes a conscious effort to speak to those who actually are the policymakers and service deliverers. Also, I would like to see more personal participation by political scientists in the process. I am reminded that the father of this Department, James Wilford Garner, had time (or took time) to serve for several terms as a member of the Urbana City Council and still become president of the American Political Science Association and a leading scholar in international law. Or we might recall John Fairlie's service as director of the landmark Illinois Economy and Efficiency Commission which was created by Governor Frank O. Lowden and which put this state in the lead of executive reorganization at the time of World War I. Equally impressive is the service record of Charles Merriam, among the all-time political science greats, who served as a Chicago alderman, as candidate for mayor and as a member of the President's Commission on Administrative Management, which set the pattern for the Executive Office of the President. Some of your present Department members have made important contributions. Sam Gove, for example, has served on innumerable state commissions and chaired many of them.

Political science, as a profession, should give more recognition to actual public service in elective and appointive office, on ad hoc commissions, in organized citizen efforts and in political parties. Also, there is a need to give special recognition to those who go the distance in conveying an understanding of our political system to the general student, to those outside the profession, to those who will assume the responsibilities of public office, and to the electorate generally.

More than anything else, we who try to make cities work need the same kind of insight and commitment that many of us learned from John Fairlie, Clarence Berdahl, Charles Kneier, Clyde Snider, Val Jobst and others here forty years ago. We need a better understanding of the processes for solving problems, the systemic solutions, the means for making self-government effective, so that it in turn can serve human needs. We need to be well grounded in the philosophy of representative democracy and to see the continuing importance of the theoretical basis of what we do, how and why we do it.

If there were a Nobel Prize for political science, I would hope that the same thing would be said of a political science laureate as was said recently when James Tobin, who grew up in this community, won the Nobel Prize in economic science. A Yale colleague and former student said: "His course in economic theory was abstract, but Jim never lost sight of the fact that the ultimate reason for studying theory was to make the world a better place. To him the ultimate justification for economics and social science was to benefit people." With that perspective, political science's responsibility to the community can be fulfilled.

Gove

Thank you very much, Bill, for that very provocative speech. I am tempted to say that I, for one, agree with everything you've said, and as far as I'm concerned, we might adjourn right now. But the social hour doesn't start until five o'clock and we have a panel of three people here who can look at this topic from a variety of different perspectives. One is Lou Pondy, head of the Department of Business Administration, who is interested in organizational theory. The second is Clark Bullard of the Department of Mechanical Engineering, who has spent quite a bit of time in Washington at the Department of Energy and elsewhere, and who is interested in environmental policy. And last but not least, our local politician-in-residence and director of the Public Administration Program, Jim Nowlan, is now with us. He is involved in public service in too many ways. And on the wrong side. Each of the panelists has been asked to speak for ten to fifteen minutes reacting to what Bill Cassella said and saying whatever he thinks an audience of political scientists should hear. I'll call on Lou Pondy first, then Clark Bullard, and finally, Jim Nowlan.

Louis R. Pondy

In one sense it is incongruous to have someone from business administration, such as myself, participating in a political science seminar. In another sense it is perfectly fitting. Two of the leading figures at Carnegie-Mellon University, where I did my doctoral work in business in the early 1960s, were Herb Simon and Jim March, both trained as political scientists. In many ways the modern theory of business organization arose directly out of their work; in that sense my participation in your seminar is not at all incongruous. My presence here is also appropriate in light of recent efforts that our two departments have been making to create a joint degree program at the graduate level between the MBA Program and the Master of Arts in Public Administration Program. I am very pleased to announce that this morning my faculty voted unanimously to endorse that joint degree program. In designing the MBA/MAPA Program, we discovered that there was already a considerable overlap of topics in the separate programs, even within our core. That in itself speaks to the close natural affiliation between our two disciplines.

There is another sense in which our two disciplines dovetail that speaks to one of the issues raised by Dr. Cassella, the emergence within political science (and, in particular, public administration) of scientific management theory, and its jointure with democratic theory. There has been a parallel in business administration, but from the other direction. Whereas democratic theory has

been the core of political science, and has been overlaid only recently with scientific management principles, business administration has grown from the other direction. We started early in this century with the groundwork of scientific management and only recently, within the last couple of decades, have attempted to build democratic theory into the practice of management and even more recently, and less so here, into relationships with the various publics and constituencies of business. What is particularly striking about the joint program that we have developed is that the Political Science Department is relying on business administration more heavily for the technical skills of accounting, operations research, and various kinds of quantitative analysis, whereas we are relying much more heavily on political science for skills in public finance and in public and governmental processes, where we tend to be weak. To the extent that we cover topics dealing with societal or social responsibility issues, they are tucked away in isolated courses or sections in various parts of the curriculum and not given a prominent place in the core. I am hoping that the students who participate in these joint programs will, at least from our side, come out with a much deeper appreciation of the necessity for understanding broad political processes, and perhaps the students from the public administration side will come out with a better understanding of what we have to offer in the way of modern scientific management principles. In any case, the convergence within political science of democratic theory and scientific management is mirrored within business administration as well.

Given this fundamental agreement, I would like to take issue with something else Dr. Cassella said. He argued that academics, whether in political science or business or any of the other disciplines, ought to be deeply involved in public affairs, not only in providing alternate frames of reference, but also in providing specific solutions to given sets of problems. My best judgment is that solving specific problems is not a task where academics have a comparative advantage. In order to provide workable solutions to specific problems, one needs to understand *local* situations, *local* circumstances, *local* institutional idiosyncrasies. If we develop general solutions at the academic level and attempt to apply them to specific municipal settings, we're liable to run awry of specific arrangements, commitments, constraints and loyalties that simply don't fit general frameworks. I'd like to argue instead that our great strength, our comparative advantage, is in providing alternate frames of reference, of providing alternate ways of looking at the same problem. To the extent that we do muddle around in actual situations, it ought to be for our own learning, for our own edification of what's wrong with the current frame of reference, but *not* for helping the system to operate more efficiently or more effectively in a given problem setting.

Let me also comment on what Dr. Cassella had to say about the failure to integrate professional and lay elements properly within governmental

organizations. First of all, we need to ask what the motivation of elected lay elements is. They may not in any sense be representative of the general public. My perception as a casual observer of municipal affairs is that frequently very specialized sectors of the public get deeply involved in local government (real estate interests among them), people who are there not to defend the general public welfare, but who, in fact, advance very specific interests. The issue is not just integrating professional and elected lay elements within government, but indeed finding some way to merge their collective interests with the general interests of the public at large.

There doesn't appear to be a parallel within business organizations to the split between professional and lay members of governmental organizations, unless one wants to identify as lay members owners of stock. Since we have faced a situation for the last several decades in which the primary managers of large corporations are not stockholders, they (the managers) have been serving interests which more closely align with the interests of professional management than with the interests of stockholders broadly considered (to say nothing of the public at large). And as stock comes to be held more and more widely, there is less of an effective mechanism by which the body of unorganized stockholders can bring to bear their interests on the management of corporations. By the same token, the public at large also lacks an effective mechanism for imposing its interests on corporate decisionmaking. What has happened, of course, is that government has stepped in to exercise that function on behalf of the public. But there is no sense in which lay elements of the populace can effectively be integrated with the professional management staff of the modern corporation, at least at the present time.

There are four other interesting parallels that one might wish to consider between business and governmental organizations. We might ask, for example, whether there is anything analogous to conglomerate corporations within the public sector. Mr. Cassella talked about the tricky concepts of state and local relationships, but I suspect that drawing a parallel between communities within the state, on the one hand, and subdivisions of a major corporation is inappropriate. The authority relations and financial dependencies that are present in a corporate office/division relationship are simply absent in state/community relationships.

Second, we have also talked about the failings of systematic analysis within government and government's attempts to take on more than it properly could manage. There certainly is a similar parallel within business. There was an attempt in the sixties and early seventies to import PPBS, systems analysis, and so forth, into business organizations with about as much success as they had had in the public sector. I was struck by the comment that we have jumped

too quickly to solutions without proper analysis and yet we must remember that management is the art of making irrevocable decisions on the basis of inadequate information. If we wait until a problem is completely analyzed we will never act. One of the important managerial decisions that has to be made is when to act. Perhaps we are agreeing in principle but disagreeing on the parameters of how soon to act. At least in business organizations, systematic analysis fails frequently by inducing paralysis. The current wisdom in well-managed companies is to be action-oriented.

Third, I'd like to draw a distinction that goes back to the question of whether the proper role of academics is to provide frames of reference or to suggest solutions to specific problems. There is an important distinction that is made in the business literature between strategic decisionmaking and operational decisionmaking. (I don't see this as the same distinction as the one between policy and implementation, because "policy" lacks the time referencing implicit in strategic thinking.) Academics have least to offer in the operational sphere. We simply don't have the time, the manpower, the knowledge of local problems, to get involved in operational details, except for purposes of personal instruction. Where I think we do have something to offer is in the strategic question of where we ought to be going five years from now. It is not surprising that the strategic questions are also the questions that are least amenable to rational analysis and most amenable to properly conceived political processes. The management and design of political processes is an area where political scientists have a particularly noteworthy comparative advantage. Therefore, I would expect political scientists to be making important contributions to the emerging field of strategic planning and management in business administration.

Finally, you have raised the question as to whether cities can be governed. I would just like to say that business organizations also raise the same question. It is not at all clear whether large business organizations can be governed either!

That's all I'd like to say, except that we are happy to be partners with you in this new MBA/MAPA Program. We are very excited about it and we hope that you are too.

Clark W. Bullard

Perhaps I should begin by explaining how an engineer like me became fascinated with problems faced by our national government. Analyzing the U.S. political and economic systems in the same way an engineer would analyze a mechanical system, I became uncomfortable with some of the fundamental assumptions on which economics and political science are built.

The first is the assumption in economics that a collection of individuals, each pursuing his own welfare, will achieve an overall welfare optimum. While this may have been a reasonable assumption 200 years ago at the time of Adam Smith, it is clearly not the case today. Now that our economy has grown to the point where environmental limits have been exceeded, thousands of individual and corporate actions impose uncompensated costs on other individuals and firms. Perhaps such physical transactions, via otherwise clean air and water, for example, are more obvious to engineers than to economists who tend to focus on pecuniary transactions alone.

Second, I am concerned that the scale of many of our recently developed technologies may conflict in a fundamental way with one of the assumptions embodied in the U.S. Constitution. We've moved over the last 200 years from an era when technologies were usually very small and their effects were felt only locally. Today's technologies, large coal and nuclear power plants for example, impose costs far beyond the boundaries of the local political or economic system via acid rain, depletion of the ozone layer, and carbon dioxide accumulation in the upper atmosphere. The effects of these technologies reach farther through space—and also through time, considering how radioactive wastes may affect future generations—than ever before. In our constitution we reserved for ourselves the liberty to throw the rascals out every two, four, or six years to accommodate changes in our values and preferences. The process of constructing a modern power plant does not fit well into that framework, because it takes ten or fifteen years to get the permission of all relevant parties involved. In a very real sense, we have to get Canada's permission to build coal-fired power plants in Illinois. It takes time to get the permission and agreement of all parties, far longer than it takes to pour the concrete, but it is necessary for the political process to work. Juxtaposing these time scales with the fundamental scientific uncertainties we face, we cannot escape the fact that a power plant conceived today may be illegal to operate ten years from now. Two governors from now, the State might deny an operating permit when construction is finally completed (the Diablo Canyon problem). That is how I became interested in such matters. While Dr. Cassella's remarks dealt mainly with how well political scientists serve municipal governments in particular, and society, in general, mine will deal with the way all academics could more effectively serve the federal government and the society at large.

The faculty of United States colleges and universities represent a quite talented pool of people who are presumably of great value to the nation. We produce diplomas and educate our youth, but when asked what we do the rest of the time, most of us will admit to spending less than forty hours a week in

the classroom. We say we spend the rest of our time producing knowledge. In fact, we might arrogantly state that we produce most of the fundamental basic knowledge upon which our future civilization will be built. The crucial point is not that this talented group of people produces a lot of knowledge, but that the knowledge is produced mainly in the areas toward which society directs our efforts.

A wide variety of powerful forces directs research toward specific areas. In 1977, when I arrived in Washington to head the U.S. Department of Energy's Conservation and Solar Policy Office, I was astonished to find that this nation knew more about the thermodynamics of a spaceship than it knew about the thermodynamics of a house. This was a natural result of the forces that had been guiding the lines of inquiry of the people, mainly university faculty, who had created the pool of basic knowledge that the nation has at its disposal to deal with specific problems. Three kinds of forces direct the production of this pool of basic knowledge. First are market forces, which presumably reflect the aggregation of the values and preferences of two hundred and twenty million Americans according to a one-dollar-one-vote rule. For example, postwar progress in chemicals, pharmaceuticals, and plastics was based on fundamental research done by university faculty funded by industry.

The second set of forces acts through the political process, aggregating the values and preferences of Americans on a one-person-one-vote basis. If it works as intended, it will often yield a different choice than the economic process; that is why both are needed. Much of our nation's recent progress in microelectronics, for example, has its roots in basic research funded at universities in part of the national defense and space programs, ten, twenty, thirty years ago.

The third set of forces is the traditional one cherished by academicians. It acts through a collegial process guided by the values and ideals of academics; individual faculty members and their peers define problems and solve them, making discoveries and producing knowledge in the process. This environment is the essence of academic freedom and allows a privileged few members of society to seek the one-in-a-million serendipitous breakthrough that will fundamentally change the course of human history.

These are the forces guiding production of knowledge in the United States today.

The academy is entering the 1980s with declining enrollments, while government budgets are swelling because of prior commitments, such as social security commitments to an aging population. Universities are facing budget pressures of unprecedented magnitude. As the number of diplomas per professor starts falling, society is going to start asking faculty what they are doing with the rest of their time. The public can be expected to question more carefully the value of the knowledge that academics produce.

I'd like to offer some suggestions on how the academy might respond creatively to these new pressures. First, by not only sanctioning, but encouraging faculty to consult more for business and industry or to take leaves of absence to work for a couple of years in the private sector, I believe that universities would find that faculty members' research interests shifted toward areas where the economic process is calling for new knowledge to be produced. The nation's economy might benefit greatly from a closer relationship between universities and industries.

Second, by encouraging the same type of consulting and leave-of-absence relationships with federal agencies and with Congress, universities would find faculty research interests turning toward problems defined as important by the political processes. I recognize that universities are a long way from recognizing a piece of testimony before a regulatory commission or before Congress as valuable as a refereed publication. But perhaps many deans and department heads today have gotten where they are today without actually appreciating the true analytical rigor of a peer review process spearheaded by half a dozen $200,000-a-year lawyers cross-examining a professor on a witness stand. Perhaps they don't realize that the questions asked by a well-briefed Senator bathed in TV floodlights can actually be more penetrating than the cryptic xeroxed excerpts of anonymous peer reviewers' comments read in the privacy of one's own office.

There's little doubt in my mind that increased faculty participation in the economic and political processes can tilt the knowledge production toward areas most valued by society. I am not suggesting a tilt from basic to applied research; I am suggesting that basic research be focused on areas most likely to provide a foundation for future applied research. The really tough question is whether academic freedom has to be sacrificed in the process, but here again I will propose a rather radical departure from tradition. I suggest that universities permit faculty to pursue their own self-determined research interests, not only in the secure and isolated environments of faraway libraries, where most sabbatical leaves are spent, but also in the company of like-minded people who may have a political axe to grind. I am thinking, for example, of a biologist who might spend a sabbatical conducting a wildlife census in an area where the Audubon Society is trying to prevent industrial development or oil drilling. The knowledge the biologist produces might only be of direct interest to that narrow group. But perhaps the intensity of the scientist's feeling about the area and the immediacy of the threat might inspire him/her to make a discovery or a methodological breakthrough that might not have occurred under normal conditions. It would be hard to deny that intensity of patriotic and nationalistic feelings played a significant role in the Manhattan Project, for example. Similarly, a meteorologist might spend a

sabbatical working with the Sierra Club on the acid rain issue, or a nuclear physicist might work for the World Council of Churches on disarmament policy. I feel such activities would actually increase academic freedom by expanding the range of opportunities available for legitimate research.

I do not feel that a tilt toward socially relevant areas of research would decrease the quality of that research. A researcher who is guided by his own personal values is always subjected to more rigorous scrutiny by peers, who might question one's ability to separate analysis from advocacy. But this is as it should be. Such research should not be discouraged or prohibited by prejudging its outcome. I believe faculty should be encouraged to spend much more time with industry, government and public interest groups, because these are three important conduits through which society tells scientists and artists what's important, and in what areas new knowledge needs to be produced.

James D. Nowlan

As flight delays prevented me from arriving in time to hear Mr. Cassella's presentation this afternoon, I will offer a few observations on the general topic of our discipline's responsibilities. Then we can see if my comments are consonant with Bill's.

Each time I return from a stint in public service, I appreciate the opportunities the academic setting provides me to organize my thoughts and to reflect on the governmental processes in which I have become caught up. Several of our mid-career graduate students in public administration have said the same. One student noted that Kennette Benedict's course on organizational behavior, while theoretical, has helped him think more effectively about the operations of the social service agency he directs.

Thus, there is value in keeping the academy separate from the arena of public service. In this way the academy maintains an environment in which detached reflections, assessment and projection can take place.

On the other hand, we in political science should leave the reservation from time to time to contribute via public service. Indeed, land grant institutions such as ours have responsibilities to the commonweal to teach, investigate *and* serve.

Our Department provides many current examples of service. For example, I was delayed today in returning from a Chicago meeting of the Illinois Sunset Committee for which I serve as a consultant. The Committee is approaching the awesome task of reviewing public utilities operations in Illinois. At the request of legislative leaders, Sam Gove and the Institute of Government and Public Affairs are preparing a retreat for state leaders on legislative-executive

relations in Illinois. A new statewide environmental consensus forum has been established by the Institute, again, at the request of important persons outside the University. And there are other examples of applied public service contributions by this University for which political scientists are well suited.

Unfortunately, the academy seems to offer little more than lip service by way of reward for those who make public service contributions. I sense this problem is especially acute at institutions with clearly established public service missions, such as the Chicago Circle campus of the University of Illinois with its urban mission. Since our professional work tends to be directed to those other pursuits which generate rewards within our system, our rhetoric about public service by the academy may be greater than our product. We must attend to this imbalance. Otherwise, unfulfilled expectations may sour the attitudes of public policymakers toward public universities.

Because of my interest in public service education, from time to time I ask senior public administrators about the qualities they look for in our graduates. Most respond rather quickly and succinctly that they simply want graduates who can think, learn new tasks, write and communicate effectively. I believe political science and public administration attract students who have this kind of potential, and that we enhance their potential.

In addition, however, I believe it is important that students headed for public management develop solid understanding of the evolving tools and techniques of computer-era management. For that reason I am pleased that Lou Pondy, Head of the Department of Business Administration, and our Department have worked together so well to develop a double degree program wherein students can simultaneously earn the Master of Arts in Public Administration and the MBA degrees. This seems to me a natural union of two important and complementary disciplines, which together can make significant contributions to both the public and private sectors of society.

Cassella

When I speak of political scientists participating in government, I believe the importance of their doing so is twofold. First, there is a particular reason for political scientists to participate in government because government is the subject of their discipline. To say we were going to separate the academy from the world of government would be like saying in medicine, we won't let people who teach in medical colleges inside an operating room. I feel that it is important for academic political scientists to have participation as part of their experience. I don't say, and I don't in any way want to be interpreted as saying, that I demean or am discouraging research, including basic research, but I do

feel that it is of particular importance for political scientists to have some first-hand knowledge of the world with which they are dealing academically.

Second, political scientists, because of their understanding of our self-governing system, can make an enormously important contribution, whether it is in elected office, appointed office, ad hoc commissions, civic leagues or political parties. Much of this participation is by its very nature avocational. Work in political parties and in citizen action groups is almost entirely volunteer, not compensated. Those of us who have been involved in all kinds of campaigns know that such involvement is very time-consuming, but it is a very important part of our democratic system. How fortunate it is when avocational, volunteer activities reinforce one's professional performance.

One thing that troubles me is the suggestion that I want political scientists or any other participating citizens to jump to solutions, that I want them to say prematurely what *should* be done, to be absolute. Quite the contrary, I'm very concerned about *absolute* solutions. I want political scientists to participate in developing solutions. I like the idea of developing frames of reference for problem solving. But one of the things that troubles me about some of the problem analysis is that in the name of scholarship the analysis becomes so complex that the problem appears to defy solution. I read an article recently about some research in elementary and secondary education, which seemed to complicate the problem to a point that it appeared nobody could be educated. One of the important things that we have to do with respect to problem analysis is try to determine whether the analysis is relevant to the development of solutions, that it develops a helpful frame of reference, rather than something that obfuscates the question under study.

I feel very strongly about lay involvement in the system. I think this must come at many, many levels. If our representation system is simply a reflection of only the specific special interests, there is an imperfection in the system which must be addressed. The ultimate authority of government must be in the hands of the elected officials, and they should have the capacity to reflect the general interest. As laymen, they can ask the experts the dirty questions. I don't think experts ask dirty questions of other experts. There may be faddism in alleged expertise, and the layman should make the expert justify his position. On all of its professional licensing boards, Minnesota has just added laymembers. It is driving some professional members crazy to be asked what they consider to be stupid questions. But they may be embarrassing questions. That kind of lay participation is very, very important. I think we are at a point in time when, as laymen, we should ask the certified experts why they are saying what they are saying, why they are prescribing what they are prescribing. They are not always right. Most of the time they are not wrong, and when they are right they can and should prove their case.

Questions from the audience

Richard L. Merritt

I will direct this question to Bill Cassella. Most of us undoubtedly agree that we should be training and encouraging our undergraduates to participate actively in the voluntaristic burdens of our society, because that is the only way to make society work. But I think that those of us in the academy who are old enough to remember the days before the revolution are finding it increasingly difficult to persuade students that this is a valuable activity. Some have called this the age of apathy; perhaps it is rather an age of reaction. I certainly detect a distinct lack of interest in this sort of thing from most of the students I encounter. They are career-oriented, but not public service-oriented. Do you think it is possible to persuade today's youth that voluntaristic activity is good for the soul, as well as for the community?

Cassella

I am afraid that I cannot offer any pat solutions. Those of you within the University community are more familiar with undergraduates than I am, but I can also sense that a kind of reaction has set in. It might be seen as a reaction against confrontation as a means of achieving results. People are saying, "We don't want to get involved," because it might be seen as confrontation.

It seems to me imperative that we talk in what I would call the calculus of scarce resources. If things are going to get done in a community, people must be involved in seeing that they are done. This is going to require a return to voluntarism, because when there are scarce resources, you can't always pay to get everything done. I do see a self-help ethic developing. For example, people are improving houses; if you can't afford to buy a new house, you fix up an old one. The neighborhood movement in communities is to a very substantial extent a self-help movement. I think that academic coverage of this—a report on the interesting and challenging elements in it—must be made a part of an understanding of the American system and the directions in which it is moving. Hopefully, that will be more inspiring than just simply saying that it is good to go out and do something in the system.

Let's take the other end of the age spectrum. Exciting things are going to go on in the senior citizen area. Rather than telling people that they must hire professionals to take care of them when they are old, there are lots of therapeutic things that they can do for themselves. They can get involved and get working. If we could get people to reflect on that and build it into their descriptive treatment of the system, it would surely help to persuade them

that it's useful. But that is not a total solution. We have moved from apathy to confrontation and now back again to more apathetic attitudes. We should be striving for the "golden mean" of constructive involvement, commitment to community and to the basic values of responsible and responsive representation and popular participation.

David Kenney

I think I may have a rather interesting perspective on some of these issues, having been both in the academy and now out of it for five years. I find that the academy is in many ways much more modest than it should be. The training and experience I had as a political scientist have been of remarkable value to me as a practitioner of government. I make use of this background every day, I rely on it, I benefit from it. It arms me in many ways, it equips me to deal with all the problems that I face. I think I am far more able to deal with those problems because I have been a political scientist than might otherwise be the case. I believe someone mentioned that I direct the Department of Conservation. At least once a week, some well-meaning person will ask: "How in the world did a political scientist ever end up heading a department of conservation?" The answer I would like to give is that political science is the best possible preparation one could have. If I were (apologies to Professor Bullard) an engineer, a planner, a person trained in law enforcement, a biologist (and I direct the work of persons with all of these kinds of training), I would be far less able to do my work than is currently the case. So my advice to the academy is: "You are too modest, you don't have as much confidence in the work you are doing as you should have. You are doing work of remarkable value. You are preparing people for remarkable roles. Be aware of the good you are doing, be a little prouder of your work." If this attitude could be encouraged, I think we might have a renewed interest on the part of academicians in attempting to direct persons into public service roles, whether they are vocational or avocational. Perhaps this meeting will inspire a bit of this.

Frederick M. Wirt

May I add that there is some new evidence about policy analysis at the local, state, and national levels in answer to the question, "What are the uses of social research or training in social research?" The answer is *not* that they are useful as hired guns; of course, you can bring them in, cook some data, and get evidence for some predetermined answer. The answer is *not* that you can generate some hypotheses that you can then test for relevance and further utility and so on. There *is* some of that.

But the greatest utility of social research comes in causing policymakers to reconceptualize the nature of their world, according to national policymakers who use social research in research by Carole Weiss at Harvard. Whether concepts came out of political science, sociology, psychology and so on, it helped shape their view of social problems. This is what's happened in about a ten-year period to many middle- and top-level federal administrators. I'm also reminded that when Ken Prewitt was here earlier this fall, he talked about the efforts of the Social Science Research Council to defend itself against recent budget cuts. One thing they could point out in defense of social research was the way in which Congressmen themselves (and this was true to some degree also in the executive offices) were using concepts that came directly out of political science research in the last ten to twenty years. This was certainly true of a lot of the research of the last thirty years in voting behavior.

This use of research was also true of those people now dead to whom you were referring earlier. At the turn of the century these scholars were important in reconceptualizing for businessmen and policymakers what the social and political world was like. And, of course, doing that in pursuit of norms—no question about this—values were considered important. But they were saying that this is the nature of the world as it is conceptualized now and here is a way of reconceptualizing it in these new value terms. Also how to move from Time 1 to Time 2 with this new concept by following new techniques. For example, the model laws of the National Municipal League were of great detail and utility back then.

That kind of training in the broader skills, then, and now, the more subtle ones, returns us to Dick's original question, it seems to me. The greatest utility we can offer our students is not how a bill becomes a law; the Constitution makers spent the largest amount of their time writing about that, but it was the only thing they could agree on. But more important than that: How do you analyze the nature of the world in which you operate—and in which you are going to have to operate—so that you either affect it or else it affects you? You have the choice of being an actor or being acted upon. So how do you conceptualize the nature of what happens out there, so that you can make a choice of one kind or another? I sometimes think that that's what the social sciences, humanities and all of us under the rubric of "liberal arts" are really trying to do—to get students to conceptualize where they stand. I suddenly realized this is starting to sound like a sermon. So I'll sit down.

Clarence A. Berdahl

All I want to say is that I have found this a most interesting and useful discussion. I would like to express my own appreciation, and surely that of the

others here, for Mr. Cassella's presentation, because it is so directly related to the Diamond Jubilee in that he has pointed out the extent to which this University and this Department have contributed to public service. I also want to especially thank him for mentioning John Fairlie and Charlie Kneier, whose names are too quickly forgotten. I have been concerned to find that many of these great names are not noticed any more. John Fairlie was, I am quite sure, one, if not *the* one, who began instruction in public administration in the United States. I think that as a department, we have reason to take pride in these things and I am very pleased that they have been noticed.

Cassella

I just want to add one thing. I probably was not as specific as I could have been in responding to Professor Merritt. One of the reasons why some of us became so committed to doing things was an extraordinary performance by Charlie Kneier in the Lincoln Hall Theatre. I can still hear some of the things that were said there, and certainly one of the major reasons why I have any interest at all in municipal government was because of the talent of a teacher and a conceptualizer and a person who taught us that it was important that we act. He made us feel that it was our job—our responsibility—and he was very persuasive, in addition to being an extraordinarily capable scholar. Thus I think that one of the most effective ways to get students involved is to link them up with people who are able to give them that kind of message. It wasn't exactly a sermon; it was a whole style, and it had substance, and those of you who had the privilege of being there enjoyed a rare opportunity. I hear others here who are saying the same thing.

Robert E. Scott

I would like to make a point that refers back to Cassella's "open meeting" comment. After Charlie Kneier's emphatic "Dern it!", one of the first things I recall hearing when I arrived here back in the late '40s was a remark by another of our excellent colleagues, Clarence Berdahl, who commented on the problem of open covenants openly arrived at. He was referring to the international level, but the comment is as meaningful in the context of the kind of local problems you have run into.

At that time our staff included not only Charlie Kneier but also many others who could cut through technicalities and get down to basic problems of value. This may very well be the basis on which so many people got hooked on public service. Just looking around this room now is a reminder of how many of our colleagues have performed in some kind of public service capacity: Clarence

Berdahl, for example, and his involvement in the United Nations Charter meeting in San Francisco. Sam Gove, of course, as well as others in the Institute of Government, and their concern with state government; Tom Page and his involvement with merit system legislation, and so on. But a very important aspect of this is that, in every one of these cases, we were acting as political scientists, not as lay people. You might say we were "visiting technical specialists."

I was a little disturbed by the idea, which was raised earlier, of hiring out for applied service outside the academy, because when we act outside the academy, we usually are not acting as political scientists. Our real contribution should and can be made as technical specialists, not special pleaders. Many of the political scientists I know who have worked in government have not really been doing political science there—they have been doing administration on a kind of applied basis. Dave Kenney is right. Our political science training is very valuable. As political scientists, we should be seeking after the abstract, the general, the "truth", if you like, and government should be applying these things. We ought to recognize that our real contributions are as the trainers of people who *will* work in government, or as visiting specialists. If and when we enter actual government work, we may do it better than someone else without our training, but we are not really functioning *as* political scientists.

Saturday Morning Session

George T. Yu

I am pleased to welcome you this morning to the final talk in the series celebrating the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Department. It will be presented by Dr. Wei-ping Tsai, who, as many of you know, is an alumnus of this University, having received his doctoral degree in the Department of Political Science with Dr. Berdahl in 1938. Before Dr. Tsai speaks, let me introduce him very briefly in terms of his very colorful background. He was educated at the University of Nanking before coming to Champaign-Urbana in 1935. Upon returning to China, he taught for a brief period. Then academia lost him for awhile as, for a number of years, he entered into government service, starting in the Ministry of Finance in 1940. In 1943 he joined the Foreign Service of the Republic of China, where he served in a number of important posts, including that of Consulate General in Calcutta, as well as in Jakarta and Honolulu. He also served as Ambassador to New Zealand and, between 1968 and 1975, as Vice Minister of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. However, he eventually returned to academia; in 1975 he was appointed director of the Institute of International Studies of the National Cheng Chi University in Taipei. I have had the good fortune to take part in a number of conferences sponsored by Dr. Tsai and his group. These are conferences that bring together American and Chinese scholars who are interested in events occurring on the China mainland and have, in my opinion, done a lot to further our and, I hope, their understanding of developments in China.

I suppose I should add one more thing at this point. About six months ago, Dr. Tsai was again called back to government service (I hope for only a temporary period), and he is now Taiwan's representative to the United States. He will speak to us on aspects of academia and international relations, based upon his own experience, and will comment upon the usefulness of the discipline to government service. So, without further ado, let me introduce and welcome Dr. Tsai. Thank you.

Wei-ping Tsai

Well, George, thank you for the elaborate introduction. You said I have a very colorful background. You know, however, I'll never turn red. This is a very special day for me. After all these years, I have succeeded in coming back to the University of Illinois, and meeting with you all on this very memorable occasion. I must thank Professor Merritt for his kind invitation. But, in fact,

about three years ago I did come back to the campus for just one day—a very short visit. I was attending a conference in Chicago. The town was covered with heavy snow then, but the trip was still very rewarding. Through Dr. Yu's good offices, I met many of the staff and faculty members of the Department and, above all, I had the privilege to spend a few hours with my teacher, Professor Berdahl, to whom I am very much indebted. Here, I wish to pay him high tribute for what he did for the Department and, particularly, for me.

Since I left Urbana-Champaign in the summer of 1938, I have had the opportunity to serve my country in several capacities and in different fields. I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to share with you some of my reflections gained through these long years of public service, and to begin my speech with the acknowledgment that what I learned at the University of Illinois has stood me in good stead in my professional life—as an academician and as a diplomat.

Generally speaking, university education is aimed at preparing students for effective performance in their future careers. However, in this complex world nowadays, the fields and posts open to college graduates and post-graduates are almost unlimited. Those graduated from a department of political science may join the government service or foreign service or public relations, the press or news media. They also may serve as foreign policy advisers, congressional aides, or as executive and administrative staff members of international organizations.

Therefore, basic training should cover a number of related subjects besides that of the chosen field of specialization, so that they can adjust themselves to the work in which they are engaged.

Meanwhile, a political science major must acquire necessary skills in his or her own national language, plus certain foreign languages, the art of expression, the ability to make contacts, and an easy adaptation to different environments.

Speaking of language, one must be able to be on his own in writing summaries, preparing reports, drafting proposals, contracts, agreements, etc. One should meanwhile be able to make public speeches and should form the habit of doing research in advance.

In view of the above, training of a political science student, aside from taking regular courses, should include writing papers, attending seminars, and engaging in extra-curricular activities in order to cultivate the ability of adaptation, so that he or she can be productive in a short period of time when embarking on a new career or assignment.

Certain aspects of government service frequently call for direct negotiation. In this regard, adequate preparation and research must be made in advance, such as studies of pertinent facts, relevant laws and regulations, and major issues involved. And one should be prepared with the logic to be used in the process of negotiation.

Sincerity and patience are virtues which frequently contribute to smooth, successful negotiation. Mutual understanding and mutual confidence should be established. In efforts to persuade and convince the counterpart, one must refrain from displaying his or her talent, eloquence, or seeming superiority. It is important to bear in mind always that the negotiator's duty is to carry on rather than to break up meaningful dialogue.

It is also important that the negotiator possess sufficient knowledge of law. Whatever legal training or experience one has acquired would certainly be an additional asset.

The third thing I wish to mention is the discharge of duties. Modern day life requires that we "fit in" in our daily environment. A successful person in society shows due respect for his or her superiors and maintains harmony with colleagues and co-workers. Public spirit should be a constant factor not only at work but at leisure as well. We often admire people who can carry on conversations in an interesting and engaging manner. Perhaps we should also admire those who listen well. Without paying proper attention and listening well to others, conversation will soon become monologue.

During school years it is advisable that a student receive good training in public speaking: Take courses in elocution and get into the habit of "speaking out"—expressing one's thoughts and interpretations in a clear, concise manner. In this respect, extra-curricular activities such as debating and dramatic arts would produce good results.

In our world today, people in public service are frequently confronted with opportunities—and sometimes challenges—for meeting with the press and media. Ability to express oneself clearly but cautiously is definitely an asset worth acquiring and cultivating.

In the discharge of duties, a government service officer should cultivate the habit of maintaining confidentiality. It is true that nowadays we frequently hear or read about "planted leaks." It may be a so-called "calculated move" or simply an unintentional or premature disclosure. To my thinking, not being able to keep confidentiality is definitely a negative element. Whether in diplomatic negotiations or trade dealings, maintaining confidentiality must be cultivated and practiced.

The fourth topic I wish to emphasize is that of the field of specialization. I noticed that in the handbook describing graduate programs, the Political Science Department nowadays offers six specialized fields: political theory, political philosophy, and jurisprudence; comparative government and politics; American government and politics and public law; public policy; international relations; and political behavior. I recall that during my years here, the fields of study were much less specialized.

As students advance from basic courses and generalized studies, they will have to select a major field of concentration as well as one or two sub-field specializations.

Specialized area studies are necessary to prepare one who wishes to enter the career field of international relations. Government agencies and academic institutions often look for specialists in area studies rather than just students in international relations.

In this connection, I may mention some specific facilities available in my country for advanced foreign students. As we expand the scope of international cultural interflow year after year, more and more foreign students go to study in the Republic of China or Taiwan. In the academic year just past, there were 3,720 foreign students from more than fifty countries pursuing advanced studies in China's language, history and culture in Taiwan. American students have in recent years numbered more than 500. Fellowships and scholarships are available. However, the Chinese language is a prerequisite for foreign students and researchers.

While I point out the need for students of international relations to choose their fields of specialization, I have to stress at the same time the need for generalists when they gradually move to the policy-making level or management levels in public and private sectors.

Since World War II, the international environment has undergone a profound change. With the improvement of international communication and means of transportation, interdependence has become a fact of international life. In government as well as in private service organizations, there is a growing need for men and women professionally trained to deal with international affairs.

In this connection, the Political Science Department should train students, especially post-graduate students, to develop their ability to identify and understand a wide range of problems and issues, political, economic, as well as cultural, and their skills to formulate and evaluate strategy and policies. With a broader background in addition to experience, the students will be fully equipped to develop their potential and to assume more important responsibilities in later stages of their careers.

A talented youth could be trained as a specialist or a generalist—or both. It would depend much on one's opportunity, interest, and dedication. But it seems to me that it would help a great deal if the educational institutions could provide such training that the students would realize the importance of the ability of adaptation, the art of negotiation, the correct attitude in the discharge of duties, and the reason why one is encouraged to choose a field of specialization, and yet not neglect the training in generalities. After that, it will be up to the students themselves to determine how far they can go and how much they accomplish.

Well, I wish to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Merritt again, and may I wish the Department continued growth for many years to come. Thank you.

Yu

Thank you, Dr. Tsai. I think you have given us much food for thought, and we will now hold a brief question and answer session.

Richard L. Merritt

From your experience as ambassador and general consul, how important do you feel it is that those working in an embassy have background training in some of the newer methodologies of the social sciences? By this, I mean an understanding of econometric models, quantitative research in public opinion analysis, and more sophisticated forms of statistical analysis. Is this useful, not useful, or how do you view all that? Given the long list of priorities which you gave--language, history, etc.—where would you place the acquisition of these kinds of skills?

Tsai

Well, I often try to emphasize the importance of training in the field of specialization. In the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China, every year fresh recruits of about thirty to forty are required to go through a period of training. In some years they are sent to the areas which they choose as their area of specialization. If you are trained in Arabic language, you would be sent to one of the Arab countries for six months or one year, to stay and to brush up your language and to have a better understanding of the local condition. They are also trained to make use of the data provided by the computer system of the Ministry. Whatever is covered by the training is nothing specific; it's a kind of training in generalities. However, I would add here that an essential factor for a successful career diplomat is, among other things, his proficiency in foreign language and his ability of adaptation.

Merritt

Does your foreign service training institute utilize simulation-type techniques, in which students in Taipei are put into cultural situations that are substantially different, brought face-to-face with hostile foreign reaction, and that kind of situation—game-playing, one might say—both to look at their reactions and to teach them techniques of coping with hostile or trick questions, and the like?

Tsai

Well, that would be ideal, if we could provide all such opportunities, but it is very difficult. What we can do is to encourage them to join such activities as oratorical contests or debates, or to attend seminars and conferences which would help them to learn how to raise questions and the art of answering questions. I think it would be good if we could offer such opportunities. Responsible government officials always face stressful situations and, most of the time, they have to rely on their wisdom and judgment.

Peter Schran

How do you deal with the issue of legal training in the foreign service institute?

Tsai

That's very important. During my term as vice-minister, only students majoring in international law and relations, government, political science, history, or economics are eligible to be candidates for foreign service personnel. Students from law schools are also included. We believe that those who have had legal training in college could be very helpful, because later on they will have to perform such duties as drafting agreements, contracts and preparing memoranda, etc.

Claudio Cioffi

Do you have in Taipei an office within the Ministry that is in charge of something like policy planning, forecasting, and so forth?

Tsai

Yes. I was a member of the Planning Board. The Planning Board has about twenty standing members. But we also invite scholars and professors from various universities and academic institutions to join us in the seminar and to express their views as experts.

Merritt

You have emphasized over and over again language training. How do you go about that? Do you require it as an entrance condition, or do you have

training programs while the people are in the foreign service institute other than the six months of living abroad?

Tsai

The competitive examination is held in three stages. In the first stage, it is a test of the candidates' Chinese and one foreign language. Those failed in the first stage of the examination are disqualified to take the test in the second and third stages of the examination. After having successfully passed the examination and joined the Ministry, the recruits can still register for further training either in foreign language or in one of the dialects in Chinese, such as Cantonese. In the future, they are assigned to those countries where most overseas Chinese are Cantonese. Their training in that dialect is essential.

Student

Are there opportunities in Taiwan for American students who want to go there to learn the language and possibly get involved with political science while they are there?

Tsai

That's right, yes. There are ample opportunities there, but not in political science. Mostly, foreign students specialize in Chinese culture or history in the Republic of China or Taiwan today. Some of them work on a part-time basis in teaching or editing in local presses or journals in English. Others help various business firms to publish pamphlets, advertisements, or to attend to business correspondence.

Cioffi

With regard to the International Affairs Institute which you direct, can you tell us briefly the sorts of research projects currently under way?

Tsai

Yes, we are talking about the Institute of International Relations in Taipei. The Institute has a history of twenty-two years now, with about 140 full-time researchers and fifty professors associated with the Institute on a project basis. The areas of specialization are: Soviet studies, communism and Mainland China affairs, international relations, and international economic affairs. In

each of these four groups, there is a convener who is responsible for mapping out the projects for the year. The research fellows turn in their reports in six months' or one year's time and they are published in the journals of the Institute.

BREAK

Yu

We are going to reconvene and move to the third part of this program, which consists of some observations by Professor Dina Zinnes of our Department and Professor Werner Baer of the Department of Economics, who will comment upon some of the ideas that were earlier expressed by Dr. Tsai.

Dina A. Zinnes

We heard earlier from Dr. Tsai that there are essentially four or five qualities in a person that he has felt, in reflecting back on his career, were particularly important to him in performing his duties. He said things about the importance of language, the importance of being able to negotiate and build trust, the importance of being able to speak well and project your ideas in an honest and truthful fashion, and the importance of finding an area of specialization as well as being something of a generalist. The question that I think we should address ourselves to now is how we train students in order to accomplish these kinds of objectives. If, in fact, this is the type of person that we are attempting to put forth with respect to the public arena, what are the kinds of programs that we need to think about in graduate education that will produce that type of individual? I think that we need to ask, in addition, whether or not there is a dichotomy between the type of training program that will produce this kind of individual, on the one hand, and a type of training program for academics. Are we really talking about two quite distinct programs? Or is there some overlap and what might that overlap be? And finally, I think it is important to think about what a possible program might really consist of. As I sat listening to Dr. Tsai my reaction was that it would be fantastic to have two or three languages under my belt. In addition to that, in connection with some of the questions that Dick Merritt raised, I think it's also important to have some analytic skills and training in some methodologies. And when I begin to think about what kind of a program that amounts to, I am immediately struck by the fact that we're talking about five, six, seven years of graduate training. That's not really a terribly realistic picture. So, I think

one of the issues here is: How do we develop a reasonable program that still accomplishes some of the objectives? I would like to hear from Werner Baer and George Yu on this subject, and I also want to ask the head of our Department, Dick Merritt, to make some comments about the training program. I think George is particularly relevant in this regard because he has just recently taken over the Graduate Office in the Department of Political Science and he has already encountered some interesting questions and issues and, I think, has consequently had to think a little bit about the nitty-gritty details of these types of issues.

Let me turn first to Werner Baer, who is our guest from the Economics Department. Werner has been interested in international politics generally and, more specifically, in development in Latin American affairs. I would like to ask him to begin with a discussion of how he sees the training program in response to some of the issues I've raised.

Werner Baer

Thank you. There are two subjects in economics that I would like to comment on. The first is on the training of students in the field of international economics and the second is on training in the field of development studies. Most of the international economics training programs do not distinguish between audiences—that is, whether the students will be heading for a career in public service or whether they will remain in academics. The typical international economics course consists of two parts. In the first we teach students to analyze the balance of payments of countries and various types of adjustment mechanisms. This is fairly straightforward and probably the most exciting part of the field because one deals with analytical constructs which have something to do with real world problems. Another part of a typical international trade course is concerned with the pure theory of international trade, i.e. the international division of labor based on comparative advantage. This leads to beautiful theoretical, very abstract, and mathematically elegant constructs. Most of that theory is useless, as it is based on special assumptions about pure competition in the real world, well behaved production functions, etc., in order to get neat results.

The literature in the pure trade theory field is enormous. Frequently, if the instructor is taken by the pure theory, he will spend two-thirds or more of his time going through abstract models in international trade theory which have little applicability. The explanation for this is that the training of the teacher himself is such that he is more secure in regurgitating theoretical models which are well developed rather than in getting involved in the murky area of business or policy. Graduate students spend long periods of time trying to

understand complex theorems, such as the famous one referring to factor price equalization in international trade. The latter is a beautiful theorem which, given special assumptions (mostly totally unrealistic), shows that in the long run, international trade results in the remuneration of labor and capital throughout the world being equalized. The explanation for such emphasis in international economics courses is linked to the doctrine which prevails in our profession. The production of abstract models is the quickest way to win cudos and to make one's way in the profession. Once a person is used to this way of operating, he is not going to change his style when he teaches students.

What is neglected in many of our international economics courses, or given only superficial attention, is the analysis of new institutional developments, such as the functioning of multinational corporations. Since an increasing proportion of international trade consists of goods moving between the parent company and the subsidiary of multinational corporations, more knowledge is needed about the factors determining such trade—this includes new knowledge and theories about decisionmaking within the multinationals. Little of this is done because this type of information cannot be neatly integrated into existing models.

Many economists prefer working with econometric models, which deal with markets that are competitive. In the context of the international economy, however, these models apply mainly to commodities—coffee, cotton, sugar, and so forth. A large and growing share of international trade, however, consists of capital goods and the servicing that goes with selling such products. Their price, credit, and conditions of sale are subject to negotiations between the buying and the selling countries. There is no easy way to determine a fair price of, say, a generator in international trade. Unfortunately such aspects of international trade are usually neglected in the literature and in international trade courses.

In sum, although economists perform a service in training students to analyze balance of payments adjustments, to measure the impact of tariffs, etc., they have neglected to go to some of the fundamental issues of international economic relations which cannot be handled analytically solely within traditional models.

Another aspect of international economic studies concerns developing nations. We have two schools of thought in developmental studies. One feels that economics is a pure science, or should be one; therefore we should be striving to discover general theoretical constructs which interpret the world for us. There are some economists who believe that we can discover relationships, which can be presented in a few reduced form equations, revealing the causes of underdevelopment and the formulae to program development. This is foolish. These economists try to emulate some of the

pure theorists in other fields of economics. What they present us, however, are usually very trivial models, which state the obvious in an elegant way—such as that, under certain conditions, given a capital/output ratio, increased savings will result in increased investments, which will lead to a certain rate of growth. Such obvious relationships are then tested econometrically on a cross-section basis, i.e. using 100 or 150 countries. The interesting aspect of development is not the fact that there may be an increase of savings under certain conditions leading to increased investments and growth. The fundamental questions are: Why are savings so low in certain African or Latin American countries? And do the policy tools that work in Brazil or Argentina work in Thailand or Nigeria? These questions are often neglected when economists try to generalize in terms of abstract models.

We train our students to think rigorously in micro and macro theory. We teach them statistical inference and econometric techniques. Then, after two or three years of graduate studies, these students want to show their masters that they too can handle those analytical tools. If they also happen to be interested in international affairs or in Third World countries, they will choose a topic which will enable them to make use of existing models. However, given the range of problems facing Third World countries or the world economy, there is a good chance that they will not choose the most fundamental ones, since these do not lend themselves to easy theoretical manipulation.

For example, state enterprises are important institutions in Latin American economies. If one wants to know something about the allocation of resources in Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Peru and other countries, one has to discover how some half dozen gigantic state enterprises function. Since one is not working with a universe of thousands of firms about which one can develop a behavior model, which can be tested econometrically, one has to adopt a more pedestrian institutional approach in understanding the behavior pattern of such entities. But economists will be reluctant to do this, since it will imply working outside of the current paradigm. And thus this topic is neglected.

I am not trying to advocate a substantial curtailment of traditional theory or quantitative methods from the curriculum of students being trained in the international field. I am only urging that in both teaching activities and research, greater attention be paid and prestige given to the study of the functioning of institutions, such as multinationals or state enterprises, and their impact on trade and development.

Yu

The problem of emulation is always a difficult one. But, if I may, I would like to comment, on a slightly different plane, specifically on some of Dr. Tsai's

remarks because I certainly found them interesting. Dr. Tsai made four or five points; however, I would like to comment upon only two or three of these, as they relate to thoughts I have had in my new role as director of graduate studies. First of all, I would like to comment upon Dr. Tsai's idea of the field specialization. I think if there's anything that we might agree on, it is that international politics is a dynamic, changing field. Certainly, there are common areas that both academics and people in the field need as basic skills. For example, for people in both the academic field who go into area types of work and those in the active service field, languages are very, very important. But, I think you would also agree that, as we implied earlier, given the increase in specialization that is occurring in international economics and trade, for example, a degree of specialized knowledge is increasing in importance. One would expect that somebody going into the Chinese foreign service hopefully would have some knowledge of the complexities of international trade, weaponry, strategy, and all the other things that are starting to emerge. One does have to keep up with some of the new ideas and new skills that are coming out of the universities. In that sense, I think there is an important linkage that universities—the graduate programs—might have to offer those in the practical services, although I'm not always convinced that everything we do here is necessarily applicable. While I would agree that we have to teach our future policy makers and academicians such things as the general ideas of international politics or policy issues, I think a degree of specialization and the acquisition of what we are to see as new skills are equally important.

My second and third comments are perhaps a bit more vague and general. I was very much taken by your references to adaptation and preparation. We like to think that we know what our graduate students are going to do after they finish their four or five years with us. But, in this increasingly tight academic market, not to mention the increasingly fast-changing world, we can no longer always be certain about where the future might lead. I like to think of the case of a student I had a few years back who was—or, I like to think, still is—a specialist in Chinese politics and economics, who is now a market researcher for Montgomery Wards. Now, you might ask: What is the relationship between training in Chinese politics and work as a market researcher at Montgomery Wards? It doesn't have anything to do directly with foreign trade or Chinese politics. The fact is that while the student was here, I encouraged the student to take courses in mathematics, in statistics, and computer science, as well as policy analysis and other subjects. The type of courses that the student took enabled the student to adapt to this other field quite easily. I think this is tremendously important because in this day and age students can no longer focus upon specific futures with any degree of assurance. But, if they graduate with a certain type of training, they are

equipped to do any number of things. Though I do not think we should neglect those who hope to specialize, as this is still an important part of graduate training, I do think we have to offer students graduate training that is not so narrow that when they finish they can only do one thing and nothing else, although I like to think that there is a linkage between what students learn here and what they can—or have to—do in the future. Now, going back to Dr. Tsai's remarks specifically, one would like to think—and I hope he will not be offended if I hint this—that what he learned here under Professor Berdahl and others some time ago, he did find useful in terms of giving him a certain preparation for the very colorful career that he has had. Perhaps we can learn from his experience that what we have been teaching, what we are teaching, and what we will be teaching our students should equally prepare them for the future.

Merritt

I want to make one simple point. We at the University of Illinois are missing a bet by not looking more carefully at our programs in international studies. Students who come to the Department very frequently are fascinated by international relations. This has been indicated recently by the enormous enrollments in our courses in international relations. General Wheelock has 280 students this semester alone in his introductory course in international relations. Next semester, too, according to pre-registration figures, we have an enormous number of students who are interested in the field. And yet, we do not really do much with these students. We should be moving toward specific programs at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels that will train people, provide them with a B.S. or B.A. in International Studies, and even a Master of Arts of International Studies that is comparable to the Master of Arts in Public Administration.

Inherent in such an idea, however, is a very serious problem, a tension to which Dr. Tsai has alluded—the tension between those of us who are doing pure theory and those of us who are trying to do something toward producing people for practical government service. My first instructor and, in a way, still my most important mentor in the field of international relations was a man named Dr. Ross Berkes at the University of Southern California. Dr. Berkes started his introductory course in international politics with the statement that a student of international affairs is a person who wishes he knew a lot more about anthropology, sociology, geography, and economics; and he listed about twenty other fields that the I.R. student should know something about if that student is to be an effective person in the international arena. (It goes without saying, of course, that language is very important as well.)

This implies that any kind of program in international relations must be a truly interdisciplinary program. It cannot be the kind of interdisciplinarity that we are so fond of, which I think is a kind of intellectual or disciplinary imperialism—that is, a situation in which those of us who are political scientists read a book on international economics and say, "OK, now I am interdisciplinarily trained. And I can go out and teach students in my course on international relations all about international trade theory, about balance of payments adjustments, and I'll even say a few words, to keep Werner Baer happy, on multinational corporations." This is exactly what we cannot do, because we are training students ultimately in a narrow disciplinary focus.

Any kind of a program we set up at the University of Illinois must be at least cross-disciplinary. This carries the implication of enormous problems—trying to find ways to coordinate a program at the undergraduate and the graduate level, trying to find ways to reward people, perhaps creating new kinds of course structures that will put students into eight-week courses rather than the typical sixteen-week structure, so that one can focus more specifically on particular problem areas. Underpinning all of this is a need for a sound basis in theory. I believe that such a base in theory can be provided in an interdisciplinary program of this sort. Such a program can follow, to some measure, the lines that Dr. Tsai has outlined. All five of his points, I think, are very important. I would add to them training in other areas, particularly quantitative techniques, because increasingly an envoy in a foreign country must be able to follow the events in that country. When someone is in the United States and is not familiar with American studies of voting behavior, public opinion analysis, etc., one cannot report very accurately. I think this was inherent in Jack Peltason's comment last night, when he was talking about the narrow blinders that one gets when sitting in Washington and reading only the *Washington Post*. There are other ways which have been developed to provide people with better knowledge of how a country is functioning and what is happening in that country. These are techniques to which we have to pay attention as well. I'm not going to pick up on Werner's challenge regarding models—I'll leave that to Madam Chairman.

Zinnes

Let me see if I can pull together a couple of themes here. As I think about what qualities I would like to see in a student leaving the institution, whether that person is going out into public service or going out into the academic world, I come down to two basic things. I think these are qualities that have been reflected in what Dr. Tsai has said, as well as some of the things mentioned by Werner Baer and George Yu.

First of all, it seems to me that if you want somebody capable of posing interesting problems, capable of looking at what's going on in the world and trying to understand what those phenomena are all about, this is somewhat comparable to your notion of being a generalist and possibly also comparable to being adaptive in some sense. Thus, one important quality is a curiosity about the world and the ability to structure that curiosity in a manageable way. I think the other quality must derive from training that allows one to begin to answer the questions. I interpret Werner's comments as saying that what we are teaching people too frequently and with too great an intensity are the tools for answering questions without providing sufficient background for knowing how to pose interesting questions. I think the same kind of phenomena that were alluded to in economics have been happening to some extent in political science. We do simply dump variables into equations and grind out results and sometimes they're not terribly interesting. The trick is not to get rid of our capabilities for learning how to use computers and processing data, or of the necessary statistical skills. Rather we should enhance those capabilities by learning how to be analytical about questions, by learning how to pose interesting questions. And, if I understand your remarks, what you were saying is that we are not doing a good job of that. We are not an adequate training ground for letting students know how you begin to ask these questions. So, it seems to me that the two primary things we should be attempting to do—and in this order—are to develop a theoretical mind set, and then, having done that, to provide adequate training in order to handle those sorts of problems. It seems to me that these are characteristics that an individual who is either going into public service or going into the academic world must have. In public service I would see it, although I've had no experience in that regard, as an ability to be out in the field, to see the phenomena, to ask the right questions so as to be able to handle those phenomena. Obviously, in the academic world it has to do with being able to ask the right research questions, with being able to provide and contribute to an ongoing research. So, although it may sound like we're disagreeing, I think there is really a consensus among us on this issue. Now I think it would be nice if Dr. Tsai could provide some concluding comments.

Tsai

Thank you. I think our Lady Chairman has pointed out very correctly that there are really two parts of the question: one is to figure out what is the training essential for political science graduates and the other is how to bring it off. Meanwhile, to respond to George's remark about how I was benefited by the training under Professor Berdahl, I wish to say that in those years, as

far as I can recall, Professor Berdahl was strict in requiring students to submit papers; he was equally strict in supervising students working on their theses. I greatly admire and appreciate his untiring efforts in inspiring and coaching the students to work through the processes of material searching, organizing and analyzing before they attempted to make comments and to draw conclusions. Such training is most valuable to those young scholars performing their duties after being admitted to any branch of government service. Secondly, I recall that when I was working for my doctorate in the mid thirties, the size of a seminar was usually around twelve to fifteen students. There was ample opportunity for each of them to participate in discussion. The atmosphere is different in a larger seminar in which participants are cautioned to speak briefly. To sum up, I am inclined to suggest that students in college should receive broader background training so that more opportunities will be open to them upon graduation. In graduate school, students should be encouraged to pursue their research in depth in their area of specialization. They should be advised, however, that when they move up in their careers, they will have to broaden their learning and be better prepared in related areas.

Yu

At this time we will have Professor Merritt give some concluding remarks regarding our Diamond Jubilee. Dick?

Merritt

Thank you, George. One of the most important values in organizing an anniversary celebration of this sort is that it does force us to look a little bit into the history of the institution. When we have done that we find that we are in the middle of a remarkable institution. We have a Department that goes back to the 1890s. It completed its seventy-fifth year as an independent department just this past year. We're now in our seventy-sixth year. Someone asked how it was that at the outset we were part of so many different departments. Bob Sutton could possibly answer that, but my own suspicion is that the Department contained people who were just as fierce in maintaining their personal views then as they are now. Either that or they couldn't pay the rent. It is a little difficult to know. But we do know that the Department, in its earliest days and in its later days, produced outstanding scholars and people who, as we learned yesterday, have participated in shaping the whole field of, for example, public administration.

This record of the past imposes on those of us who are currently with the Department of Political Science a very great burden. It is, however, a burden that we do want to shoulder. It is the burden of insuring that the tradition of the University of Illinois in the field of political science be carried into the future and be strengthened. Yesterday afternoon, we talked in the discussion with Bill Cassella and others about how to expand our program in the area of training public servants and academics in the domestic area. I think we have some good ideas. As Lou Pondy announced yesterday, the Business Administration Department has now approved the joint MBA/MAPA Program. And it is likely to be accepted soon in our Department as well. In the field of international studies, the ideas that we have been bouncing around today will not die this morning. The University has set up a blue ribbon committee under Dean Peter Hay of the Law School. Two members of the committee are Werner Baer and Dina Zinnes. They are looking into the question of what kind of an international studies program the University of Illinois should have. And the kind of dialogue that we have been having this morning is the kind of dialogue that I think will be instrumental in creating the kind of department that can help political science meet its reponsibility to the various communities it serves.

Interview with Clarence A. Berdahl

by Frederick M. Wirt

This interview with Clarence A. Berdahl, professor emeritus of political science, University of Illinois, was conducted by Professor Frederick M. Wirt on October 21, 1980. Its purpose was to plumb the memories of Professor Berdahl on the nature of academic and professional life over the many decades of his involvement. Professor Berdahl had just turned ninety the previous June. This interview, conducted in his apartment off the Illinois campus, starts simply with his recollections of what it was like to be a student here in his early years.

C. Well, the story of how I came here is a little complicated. I was always anxious to study law from the time I knew anything. I graduated from St. Olaf College in 1914 and took the civil service examination because I wanted to go to Washington and I knew that there were evening schools of law which I might be able to attend. I took the examination in South Dakota and accepted a position to teach in Fergus Falls High School in Minnesota. I had only just begun—I think I'd taught a month or six weeks, or something like that—when I got an offer from the civil service. This was unusually soon, but it happened because South Dakota was below its quota and, therefore, I suppose I was pushed up ahead of others who passed equally well from Maryland and other places. I was released from the high school and went to Washington and entered the civil service, but by this time it was too late in the year to start a law course. I was in the Archives Division of the War Department for almost a year and I lived with a cousin who was secretary to Senator Sterling of South Dakota, who was also a family friend. This was very important because it gave me entry to almost everything on Capitol Hill, and I had what might be considered a graduate course in government instead of getting into law. My mother died in the spring, so I had to come home to the funeral and I didn't go back.

The year was now 1915. I did not go back to Washington, but applied again at Fergus Falls High School and they took me on. This time I taught there for a year and went back to Washington in the summer where I served in the Library of Congress as an assistant in the Periodicals Department. Again, I intended to study law, but once again it was not the time to enter. I began to

think things over and decided that the sensible thing was to go to the University of South Dakota Law School in my home state. I hoped to get a master's degree at the same time within the three years, and planned to concentrate on law and do the master's on the side. When I got down there and talked with people in the law school and others, their advice was rather to concentrate on the master's degree and do law on the side, which I did. I took two law courses and they were the best I had there. They were taught by Professor Vanneman who happened to be from an Urbana family. A few weeks later, I got to talking to him at some YMCA reception, I think, and he said, "Oh, what you should do is go to the University of Illinois and study political science. I know Professor Garner. I was a major in political science and I graduated from the Law School there and I'll write letters to Garner and maybe we can get you a fellowship." Well, this sounded attractive, so I did apply at Illinois, which was hardly known at St. Olaf at that time, and I applied also to Chicago and Princeton. I selected Princeton because my favorite St. Olaf professor was a Princeton man. Although he never especially talked Princeton to me, I thought about it through him and it seemed the possible one out of the Harvard-Yale-Princeton trilogy. I was turned down at Princeton. I was accepted at Chicago and at Illinois, but in Chicago they offered me only tuition and I had to do work for that, I think in the library. At Illinois, they offered me three hundred dollars and I was not allowed to do any work other than study, so I accepted that.

While I was at the University of South Dakota, we got into the war and military training was begun on the campus. I had sense enough to take it, and also I applied for admission to the second officers' training school which opened up, I think, in August of 1917. I was accepted and spent several weeks at Fort Snelling, near Minneapolis. But, with a good many others, I was discharged before the school ended, the explanation being that there were orders to cut down the numbers. Meanwhile, I had written to Kinley, who was dean of the Graduate School at the University of Illinois, to tell him that I had enlisted and didn't know my future. He replied and said that they would hold the fellowship for me through October, or something like that. I was very much humiliated at the time by being discharged from the military service, but it turned out to be a good thing because now I could enter graduate school at Illinois. I came here, therefore, in October of 1917, a little bit late, but not too late.

F. You finished your Ph.D. in 1920 as I recall, and then joined the faculty as an instructor.

C. I was at the University from October 1917 until June 1918, when I was drafted into the army and spent the next year at Camp Funston in Kansas and Camp Pike in Arkansas. I didn't get overseas. But after being discharged from

the military service I was able to come back to the University of Illinois and, as you suggested, received my degree in 1920.

F. Give us a sense of what graduate student life was like at this university in that period from, say, 1917 to 1920, when there was a relatively small faculty. They hadn't yet moved into Lincoln Hall, had they?

C. They had moved into Lincoln Hall from University Hall before I came and the situation for graduate work in political science was this and continued for some years: The whole east side of the third floor of Lincoln Hall was made into seminars, graduate seminars, and libraries for graduates and advanced undergraduates. History and political science had a library together and each had a smaller room off it which was called a seminar room. The political science seminar was off the south end of the library, and there we had our weekly seminars and other graduate instruction. It was there that I sat and wrote my thesis. South of the History and Political Science Library on the east side was the Economics and Sociology Library. These libraries were well stacked with books in open shelves; ours, the History and Political Science Library, had, as I remember, about 30,000 volumes for graduate and advanced undergraduate students.

F. There was no central library at that time—these were departmental libraries?

C. These were departmental libraries and, yes, there was a central library in Altgeld Hall, which was not called Altgeld Hall at that time. It was the library, and it was built as the library.

F. Was it a graduate library?

C. It was for both graduate and undergraduate use, but the departmental libraries had more books at that time, and they were libraries especially for the advanced undergraduate courses and for graduate students. This was very convenient for us, whether students or teachers.

F. What were the students like? Were they mostly from small-town backgrounds and small colleges?

C. There were both men and women. There were women especially in history. I recall at least three at this time, one of whom took her degree the same time that I did and we worked together. I don't know that I can comment on just what they were like, but there were, of course, fewer than there are today. The graduate students all knew one another, not only in history and political science and sociology and economics because of the libraries, but we knew many, probably most, of the others. There were occasional meetings with the other graduate

students and there were social affairs—it was to me a very interesting group. I became acquainted with many students outside my own area, especially with those in classics. They also had their place in another part of Lincoln Hall. We used to go out with them, especially on Sundays. This was the beginning of the hiking group which I joined and have continued with to this day.

F. Did the students live in dorms or did they live in private housing, apartments?

C. No, there were no dormitories at that time at all; they lived in private houses. I lived on Healey Street, just off First Street. I lived there during my graduate days and during my first year on the faculty, and after that I moved into the University Club.

F. Your $300 scholarship sounds like a very meager sum to live on for a year.

C. It seemed like a huge sum to me at that time because I was so poor, and it was increased to, I think, $350. I held a fellowship during my entire graduate career.

F. When a graduate student came here, were there procedures that everybody had to go through, certain sets of courses, preliminary examinations and so on, or was it pretty much up to him or her to pick what was wanted?

C. Well, in political science, at any rate, there were no examinations covering entrance. They looked at your credentials, and I was admitted, of course, at the same time I was given the fellowship. With respect to the procedures of graduate study in political science, there were very few requirements at the time, but certain of these continued for many years. We had a weekly meeting, called a seminar, where we got credit for our thesis. All the graduate students and all the members of the faculty attended, and the students had to read their theses or parts of them and were subject to criticism. I probably read every word of my thesis because there were only two or three others at the time.

F. The records that I've collected indicate that for the period 1910-1919, there were a total of only four Ph.D.'s granted in the department, but twenty master's degrees.

C. I was the fifth to get the doctorate.

F. In the 1920 decade, my figures show they had increased.

C. The first man to get a Ph.D. in political science was Japanese and apparently he got it the next year after Garner came here and established the department. It wasn't formally a department at the time, but he was here.

F. Did graduate instruction involve taking any graduate courses other than this seminar?

C. Oh, yes.

F. Did everybody take the same set of courses or was there a choice?

C. There was some choice but not very much, as I recall it. There were very few on the faculty—Garner, Fairlie, Story, and Cushman—during the time I was here as a student. Mathews was on the faculty, but he was on leave when I was first here and only came later.

F. Thomas Reed Powell had come and gone.

C. He'd come and gone, yes. I occupied the same room in the University Club which he had occupied, which is an interesting little bit.

F. When you had worked through these courses, at some point did you have to take special examinations for admissions to candidacy, to write your thesis, as we do now?

C. Well, you had to take the oral examination. That was what we called the preliminary examination.

F. How long was that?

C. There was no set length, but it would be at least two hours and this, of course, was an examination on your courses. They might also quiz you on your general interest in and knowledge of political science.

F. Do you have any recollections about your oral examination?

C. Well, I recall that I had it.

F. It's usually a subject of considerable anxiety.

C. I didn't worry about it as much as others worried about it. For example, Robert Cushman was here at that time—he was about my age, and we had become very friendly. It happened that Roger Adams, the great man in chemistry, had come to Illinois just the year before I came, and he and I used to drop in at Cushman's. Cushman was married and had a house, so we would drop in there virtually every Sunday. We walked all over the two towns on Sundays and became very close. I remember that the evening before I was to take my oral, Cushman insisted upon taking me out for a long walk. He thought I needed this kind of thing and I suppose it helped. I think he was afraid that I'd sit down and wear myself out studying, which, of course, I didn't do and which I never encouraged any students to do.

F. I guess there were generations of graduate students that had their introduction to constitutional law in Cushman's casebook and that of his son,

Cushman, Jr. They obviously didn't waste any time getting through degree completion, it would seem, as you went through in very short order. Was your speed typical, or was that a specialty?

C. I think it was more or less typical. It was required at that time, not only here, but in almost all universities except Columbia, that you do all the writing of your thesis on the campus. You weren't allowed to leave. You could get leave-of-absence if you needed to go to Washington or anywhere else for material, but otherwise you were expected to do all your work here and that speeded up the process. In other words, you didn't do what has become common more recently—complete the oral exam, and then go away and teach or earn money somehow and write the thesis more slowly.

F. You didn't begin teaching until the degree was completed in 1920?

C. This is true, except that in my last year when I was completing my thesis, John Fairlie needed help in his municipal government course. Garner approached me about this, asked me if I'd be willing to give up my fellowship and take this assistantship, which meant meeting sections. Since I was very well along on my thesis and really had extra time, I somewhat reluctantly agreed to do this. However, Kinley, as dean of the Graduate School, wouldn't allow it, but he said Garner could use me anyway. In other words, I could teach but I couldn't get paid for it. I kept my fellowship and taught this one section in municipal government without any compensation, the theory being that I benefited from the experience.

F. When you came aboard as a full-time instructor in 1920, what was your teaching load?

C. Well, roughly around nine to ten hours is what most people had.

F. The University was on a semester system at that time?

C. Oh yes, the semester system. But I was fortunate in one way my first year, because Garner went away on leave and I was given his senior course in international law to teach, which was very unusual for a beginner on the staff. This was three hours and in order to make up the schedule, I was given seven sections of American government. At that time American government was taught with two lectures a week and one discussion section, which met for one hour, so I had ten hours, you see, by giving the seven sections.

F. How large would your sections in American government be?

C. They usually ran around thirty-five to forty or so at that time. I didn't mind the repetition, repeating the same thing seven times. Each section seemed to

me almost a new course. That didn't trouble me at all. The trouble was that I had an enormous number of papers.

F. Yes, that never changes.

C. And later, very soon after that, we changed the American government course to one lecture a week and two meetings in discussion sections. And still later, when I was in charge of American government, we stopped the general lecturing altogether and met only in discussion sections. You can attribute that to my lecturing perhaps.

F. I would be interested in your comments on the faculty during the 1920s. We probably will take this by a decade at a time. For example, during the first ten years that you were on the faculty, what was the recruitment process?

C. Well, I never thought of there being a recruitment process until more recent years. There was little change in the staff at that time. In fact this was one thing that Garner was very proud of, and he was very much hurt when in 1924 Story decided to leave, because people had not been leaving. Of course, I wasn't formally a part of the recruitment process, except that Garner, who was head and solely responsible, always consulted every one of us about any change. But there was very little change in the faculty in the first six years.

F. The faculty did not vote on admission to the Department. That was a decision made by the chairman on this own, with advice. Is that the picture?

C. Yes, except that Garner, although he was head, and therefore didn't have to consult anybody, always acted as a chairman. He talked to us—of course, there were very few of us—and I don't think he made any decisions of any consequence or even any of little consequence without talking to someone first. It might sometimes be on the fly, but he would always let us know what was gong on and ask our advice. It was the headship system formally, but the chairmanship in fact, and that continued under Fairlie also.

F. In the 1920s, that period when you had limited turnover, would faculty members being considered for appointment be invited to make a presentation to the Department?

C. No, I don't think we ever did that.

F. Then the choice was made simply on the basis of recommendation?

C. Yes, and on knowledge. We knew of them, or we knew people who knew them. If there was a Harvard man under consideration, we wrote to the Harvard people and that sort of thing. But during my first years, there was very little of that. Mathews was away and came back and his return affected

my work. Pitman Potter and Cushman left and that created an opening in public law, or constitutional law. Garner offered it to me and I had accepted it, when Mathews wrote that he'd like to have it. Garner came to me in great distress and said, "I told you you could have it and you shall have it if you want it, but Mathews is, after all, your senior, and he'd like to have it," and, of course, I immediately let him have it. John Fairlie then turned over his course in political parties to me, so I got what I much preferred anyway. We were few enough that things could be done this way, but I never thought of this as recruiting.

F. How about another faculty process—that of tenure decisions and promotion decisions? How were those arrived at in the 1920s?

C. Again, it's difficult for me to say. You were promoted through recognition of what you did in a scholarly way as well as your teaching. But I might tell you what happened in my own case. In the summer of 1920, I did my first university teaching at the University of Texas. I had been invited to Texas both for the summer and for the regular appointment and I accepted the summer and rejected the regular. At Texas I met Dean Pierce Butler from Tulane, who lived in the same house. He invited me to Tulane for the summer of 1921, so I went to New Orleans that summer and while I was there I was offered a position in the women's college of Tulane, but I didn't accept. I wasn't interested enough to negotiate, but, of course, I wrote Garner about it. Nothing happened at all until, I think, at the end of the first semester, I was promoted from instructor to associate. We had at that time a rank between instructor and assistant professor, called associate. In my case, it involved no increase in salary. Therefore, I got this additional rank, but in fact the first paychecks seemed to me a reduction of salary. An instructor was paid on a ten-month basis and an associate on a twelve-month basis, so although I got the same salary, my checks were smaller and I had to get used to that.

F. You know, you moved very properly through the academic ranks, I must say. I noticed in the directory that you progressed from instructor to professor between 1920 and 1930.

C. Yes.

F. What else happened in terms of promotion and tenure? Give us some insight into how the Department handled such things.

C. Well, I served for four years as assistant professor and then I was promoted to associate professor, and during that year I was offered a position in Pennsylvania, and this gave me my professorship. I was never told what this was based upon. My thesis had been published and I had written some other

books and articles, I had received several offers, and I suppose they considered that I did reasonably good teaching, so I got these promotions.

F. Were you just in effect called in by Garner and told, "We're going to promote you," without any review process that you were conscious of?

C. There was never anything that I consciously participated in.

F. And you think that was fairly standard for other members of the Department in that decade?

C. Yes. The professorship business was in my case handled by President Kinley himself. Dean of the College Babcock was away that summer when I received the Pennsylvania offer, so I dealt directly with Kinley. Garner may have been away—I can't seem to remember his having anything to do with this at all, but he must have. At any rate it had to be determined by the president who, of course, would do it nominally in any case, but this time he handled all these summer matters that came up.

F. One other question—about teaching. How important was teaching in the 1920s to one's advancement? How did they know how well one was doing as a teacher?

C. It seems to me that we had much the same language about this that we hear now. That is, there were those who insisted that teaching was neglected and others who thought it was taken into account—that we had to consider the matter. Certainly teaching and the extent to which you applied yourself were taken into account, and I suppose I had a good record because until I was married, I spent almost all my time in Lincoln Hall, including evenings and some Sundays.

F. Did classes run through Saturdays then?

C. There was always an attempt made to hold Saturday classes. There were a few scheduled, but there weren't very many.

F. They usually weren't successful then?

C. No.

F. It was assumed that you would contribute to scholarship and maybe to the profession. Was that made quite clear to you as you went along, or was it something that you just did because it was a passion with you?

C. Well, I think it became a passion with me, especially in relation to the American Political Science Association and other professional organizations.

F. Now, you might set out on the record your association in the 1920s with the *Review*.

C. I was fortunate, I suppose, because John Fairlie was managing editor when I came to Illinois. He was the second managing editor of the *Review* and he promptly asked me to do the bibliographical section which was called "Recent Publications of Political Interest," and this I did for twelve years. I compiled that list and that put my name on the masthead of the *Review*, so my name became known, I suppose. This was a great advantage and in 1923, when John Fairlie went on a year's leave of absence, I was appointed the acting managing editor for the year. Of course, I knew all the people associated with the journal. I especially learned to know Frederic Ogg who succeeded Fairlie as the managing editor. He had two desks in his house in Madison, one of which he used as the editor of the *Review*; the other was the desk he used as professor of political science at Wisconsin. I've seen that many times.

F. What were the duties like for the year when you were editor?

C. Well, I had to do a good deal of work. Of course, the first number was already arranged by John Fairlie and all I had to do was to see that these papers came in and that they were properly edited for the *Review*. It meant more work than I expected, because among the reports and papers that were published during the period I was editor were reports of Association committees that were very active. For example, there was a committee on research, of which Charles E. Merriam was chairman, and there were others. John Fairlie had agreed to publish Merriam's report, which came to me, and I have to say that it was in terrible shape. I knew Merriam very well and, of course, he was one of our greatest men and I loved him, but his stuff was messy and I had to sit down and rewrite it in order to get it into shape.

F. And did he accept that?

C. Oh yes, no question about it at all. He may have expected this, I don't know. I didn't communicate with him about it before publication. He accepted it completely. Also, we had a man in Nebraska, Ralph Boots, who had for some time contributed articles on governors' messages. He summarized the messages of governors by subject matter, but this time he hadn't classified the material, and it was again pretty messy, so I had to sit down at the University Club, sort out his material, and reclassify it. It was a lot of work.

F. How about articles that were just submitted for possible publication? Did you read and make decisions on them, or did you use referees to help you?

C. We didn't generally use referees. We never used that term, but papers were frequently submitted to others for advice, especially to others on the board of editors. The first number was, as I have said, all set up to see it through the press; most of the papers caused no such problems as those just mentioned.

F. So, in the 1920s, if I had wanted to seek publication in the *Review*, I would submit an article to you and you would be the one who would make the decision, not the editorial board or referees?

C. Yes, and Ogg did this when he was editor, though occasionally he sent me a paper to review, especially in political parties. I think for the most part the editor may have consulted other people when convenient, but there was no system at all. That same situation prevailed at the University here during the twelve years that I was chairman of the board of editors for *Social Science Studies*; we three editors reviewed the papers. Once in a while we sent a manuscript to somebody else; I remember sending one to a man in Ohio. Later on, I think they did this quite regularly, but it was assumed to be the responsibility of us on the board of editors.

F. Another professional responsibility in the modern period is, of course, attendance at professional conventions. Your case may have been special, because you were, in a sense, an officer of the Association through your work on the editorial board. But was it expected that the average member of the Department would go to these conventions and give a paper?

C. Yes, very much so. It was especially important to attend, and you generally gave a paper on invitation during those years. This was questioned when the University began to pay for attendance.

F. That was my next question: Did you have to pay for that out of your own pocket?

C. We had to pay out of our own pocket until 1951.

F. And you still went to Washington, New York, and Chicago?

C. Oh yes. I never missed a convention when I was in this country; I have missed only one or two since I've been here, and those for special reasons. I got the convention habit.

F. Would the Department provide a typist for your papers?

C. You didn't have a typist as a graduate student or anything like that, but faculty members sometimes did. I don't remember for how long we in political science did not even have a secretary. Later on, there was a secretarial or

stenographic pool and we could draw on that pool. We had to pay for it and we had an understanding that Garner, Fairlie, and I shared that expense.

F. That was also for doing the work for the *Review*, wasn't it? You had to handle a lot of that correspondence?

C. Well, I can't remember just exactly how much, but I think I had—I'm not quite sure—$400 or $600 for expenses.

F. Did the University provide the average faculty member with money for research, as the Research Board does today?

C. Yes, it did, but only to a very limited extent, and it took something to find it out. I was for many years on what we then called the executive faculty of the Graduate School, and it was only more or less by accident that I learned that there was a research board which you could tap for money. This may have been due to my own negligence, but I don't think it was a matter of general knowledge and I never did know exactly when this was set up. But, of course, it came to be a much bigger thing later on. I never got any help myself; I suppose I never asked for it. When I went abroad for fifteen months in 1931-32, I did get a social science grant. At that time, you see, I had to go on half salary and that grant was sufficient to make my income equivalent to full salary. I took my wife along, so we needed it.

F. Thinking back on your colleagues in the Department during the 1920s, would you care to give us a brief description of some of these men whose names you've been mentioning?

C. Well, they were an extraordinary group. Garner, of course, was a real scholar. I mean, he was producing articles all the time and he was a very good teacher as well, especially in graduate work. He lectured almost entirely, even in his graduate course in international law when he'd have only a couple of students. He sat and talked practically all the time. I did a long paper on German political theory for him, and was very much hurt because I never had a chance to read it in the seminar. And his standards were very high. You had to do very good work.

Fairlie was very different from Garner. He was a Scot and he had the Scottish burr and he almost always practically whispered. Very difficult to hear. Excellent in graduate work where you sat around a table. As for the undergraduate teaching, I think he probably shouldn't have done it, but I've run into many people, even very recently, who remind me that they were students of his and enjoyed it very much. He had an extraordinary mind—knew everything and expounded well—so that those who were interested and sat in the front row and did the readings got a great deal out of Fairlie, too.

But he was totally different in his approach. He was really the founder of work in administration in the United States. I don't think there was anybody who preceded him or was better than he. Very soon, he was one of a number.

Mathews was extraordinarily quiet. He had an office on the fourth floor, while the rest of us were on the third. You practically always had to go to see him. He didn't come down. He did his work quietly. Garner liked to tell this about Mathews: He got his Ph.D. at Johns Hopkins and when he went there, he went to consult the great Professor Willoughby and they agreed upon a thesis subject; the next time this man saw Mathews was when he brought him a completed thesis. I'm inclined to believe the story because that's about the way he operated, just quietly sat and did his work. He was a good teacher. Students who wanted to learn got a great deal out of him, but he just didn't do anything dramatic. He didn't stand on his head—he didn't do anything but sit there and quietly teach. But he taught extremely well and wrote very well. He liked to teach a course for a few years and then he'd write a book on it and turn to something else. Mathews was like that. Very quiet, very efficient. The result was that a great many people in the University didn't know him and every once in a while people would stop and ask, "Who is this man Mathews?" They'd seen his name in the papers or something. So, I was greatly surprised one year when he was about to go away, I believe, and he came to me about a course he had been teaching. It was a course that we generally called "Police Power," although it had a fancier name, "Constitutional Aspects of Social and Industrial Legislation." He had been teaching that and a course in constitutional law. On this occasion, he asked me if I'd be interested in the police power course and told me that he was ready to give it up. So I took it on, taught it for five or six years, and enjoyed it very much. At that time this was a small class—we insisted on a small class. I think I had twelve in the course. It was one of the best classes I ever had. Some of the best students in the University, including Irving Dilliard and others of his kind, were in that class. A marvelous group.

F. How about Robert Cushman?

C. Of course, he was tops. As I mentioned before, I knew him particularly well. We were very close personally, but I wasn't together with him long. He came when I was a graduate student. Then I went away for the war and when I came back he had accepted the Minnesota position and was getting ready to leave us. I knew him well over the years, but not as a colleague here at Illinois.

F. Were there others in the Department in the 1920s whom you'd like to mention?

C. Pitman Potter, whose name perhaps you know, came here while I was in the army. He took over Mathews' course on constitutional law. He was

especially interested in the international area, and was the first one in the United States to give a course on international organization. It was really on the League of Nations and other related agencies and later I took that over. He left after not more than two years. The position he held here was just a temporary one. But I learned to know him very well. In fact he was at Wisconsin the year that I was acting managing editor of the *Review* because of John Fairlie's absence. It happened that Ogg was also away on leave that same year and Pitman Potter took over Ogg's work as secretary-treasurer of the Association. That officer conducted the business operations of the *Review*, so that Potter and I, as youngsters carrying on the *Review* for a year, had a very heavy correspondence.

F. To return to the conventions in the 1920s: What would be the average attendance? Now, as you know, it's maybe 2,000-3,000 people.

C. Well, certainly not more than a couple of hundred, if there were even that many to begin with. In fact, for many years we had to meet with another association in order to get railroad rates, which we got then. We met most commonly with the history people, but we also met with the sociology and economics people. You'd almost always try to have one or two joint sessions. I don't remember now how long this continued.

F. The business meeting of the Association must have been a very small club-like affair at that time.

C. It was small group, but also a business-like group. We attended in those days. I took active part and was much interested. I was chairman of a number of Association committees. I was chairman of the Program Committee the year that Walter Shepard was president. I don't remember what year it was. I was chairman of nominations and had the pleasure of nominating Arthur Holcombe for president. At that time that was not a very difficult matter, as I'm sure it is now, because there were very few members who would be recognized as eligible and almost everybody, I think, probably expected Holcombe's nomination. And then I was made chairman of a committee to study the *Review*. There was a good deal of criticism of the *Review* by a younger group, and it seemed desirable to take their views seriously into account. Other members of that committee were Arthur Holcombe, with F.F. Blachly of the Brookings Institution, and a fourth man. Our report on the matter was published in the *Review*.

F. What were the young group's criticisms of the *Review*?

C. This was during the early years of the New Deal, so a number of these critics were in Washington; I was also in Washington at that time, and held several meetings with them, sometimes with another member of the committee

or by myself. I don't think we ever had the four members together, though occasionally there were two or three of us. I should, but do not now recall the names of those who were active. There was a group that had become very critical of Ogg, who had been editor for a number of years. They felt that it was time to change and they had varying kinds of criticism. There were those who said the bibliographical section was worthless, and then others of them said that was the best part. And there were those who thought the *Review* did not have nearly enough on political theory and others who thought there was plenty, and so on. There wasn't any agreement among the critics and it's a little difficult for me now to bring back the exact criticisms.

F. Were there criticisms of the *Review* for the quality of the articles?

C. Yes, this was a common criticism.

F. Was there criticism about the orientation?

C. We as a committee and I as chairman could never get any specific kinds of criticisms; there was just this overall critical feeling. We made, in general, a report favorable to the *Review*, and noted especially that criticisms of Ogg had no real basis. But we also made some suggestions with respect to the nature and content of the *Review* which seemed to clear the air somewhat.

F. Well, let's move this account into the 1930s. Let's start back at the level of the Department with the students during the Great Depression. What differences would you point to during that period, other than the growth of the student body, majors, and the doctoral programs? I notice, for example, that in the 1920s there were nineteen Ph.D.s, but in the 1930s there were twenty-nine, so there was growth there and also at the undergraduate level. Characterize the students—graduate and undergraduate.

C. Well, we always had a considerable number of graduate students, although a small department. We had more Ph.D.s in that period than they did in the History Department and especially more than they had in English, which was, I suppose, the largest department on campus.

F. Why do you think there was that difference?

C. I don't know. I wondered about it a great deal. I can't say that this lasted, but certainly for a period, and I can't name the years, we had perhaps from two to four a year. I'm not sure. I doubt that there was a year during my earlier association in which we didn't have at least one Ph.D.

F. In that period of the 1930s what kinds of changes, if any, were there in the character of the student body? Were the undergraduates suburban Chicago

students yet, or did they still derive pretty heavily from the small towns? What were they like?

C. I'm not sure that I could say. I suppose they were always pretty heavily from Chicago. Evelyn and I noticed this particularly when we were at Southern Illinois University because the first couple of years there it was a very unsophisticated country group. They were quite religious and this sort of thing, and then came the great influx. They couldn't get in here, so they came by trainloads to Southern Illinois and we noticed the difference. I didn't mean to get into Southern Illinois University, except that we noticed this change which I never particularly noticed here. During the war, when the boys were away, I had a class that was all girls except for one student. Most of the time these were very good students. They varied, of course, but as the years went on my classes became better and better, as well as larger and larger.

F. Did the quality of the faculty change? What faculty changes took place during the 1930s?

C. We added; we got Charlie Kneier and Charlie Hyneman, who were both our own Ph.D.s and were brought in together. Charlie Kneier had been away at Texas and Nebraska, his only outside places. We brought him back from Nebraska. Charlie Hyneman was at Syracuse for a year and we brought him back from there the same year. We had Charlie Hagan. Of course, during the war we didn't need as many faculty. An interesting thing happened then at the University here. Some departments were almost denuded and the administration sent around a questionnaire to find out what subjects a person was competent to teach other than his own. This meant that we loaned Sibley, I think, to either the Department of Physics or Mathematics. He had a good preparation in those subjects. We had at least two cases of this sort of thing.

F. Do you have any sense that the Great Depression had any particular impact upon the Department that you can recall?

C. It had rather considerable impact, of course.

F. Salaries?

C. Salaries were reduced.

F. Actually reduced?

C. Yes, Garner and Fairlie had their salaries reduced and I believe they were never fully recovered. Fairlie retired at $8,000 and Garner had died three years earlier. I know that he had less than ten, because at the time there were notably four professors in the University who had $10,000, Garner not among them.

F. And they were the highest?

C. They were the highest paid. They were reduced; all of us were reduced. During a part of the Depression we were even issued scrip, as I remember. What I would say is that in the Department of Political Science we were really a family group. We were a small enough group so that we were with one another a great deal and there were no real problems or difficulties that I can recall. We never inquired into a person's politics or anything like that. It never occurred to us to do this and it turned out that we had all shades of opinion, but there were never any problems of relationship. There were disagreements on occasion, but there was never any serious holdout; then and during my own chairmanship there was never anything of the sort. You asked about any special situation or problems during the war, and I would say that the main problem of the war was seeing faculty going away, being called away for various purposes. In our case, the losses kept up with the registration so that there were no important problems of recruitment or of finding our own staff out of work.

F. Did your salaries start to pick up during the war years?

C. They didn't really start to pick up until after I retired.

F. You mentioned that there was some discussion of the University paying you in scrip. Could you explain that?

C. During the Depression there was a brief period—I don't think it was more than a year, and probably less—when they issued the scrip which the bank would honor. I'm quite sure that's correct. It was done in a great many places. You didn't get a check; you got something in its place. I suppose that it was a promise to pay which they later had to make up through appropriations. I don't recall the details. It wasn't very serious.

F. I know that in the profession a number of political scientists began to involve themselves with work in the national government, studying it, and sometimes working as administrators. Were there any in the Department here who went to Washington?

C. Yes, even during World War I there were some. Story was away in Russia for two years. Fairlie was often involved with the financial problems of various Illinois counties, and during the war he headed one of the War Department sections. When I came here he had finished the work of the so-called "Efficiency and Economy Committee" for the state of Illinois. Fairlie was executive director of that work and he was really responsible for the reorganization of Illinois state government, which was the first state government to do what we call reorganize, and that was through the Efficiency and Economy Committee. There were other occasions when our neighboring

county, I think it was, got into financial difficulty and called on John Fairlie to straighten them out. And Mathews worked with reorganization in the state of Oregon.

F. Did any of them involve themselves with Washington in the New Deal agencies?

C. In the New Deal period, yes, and especially after the war came on. Fairlie was away in the War Department, but that, as I said, was in World War I. During World War II, I began to do service. For two years (1942-1944), I spent a week out of every month in Washington, travelling back and forth on the B&O. This occurred while I was chairman of the Department, so I did both things at the same time. During the summer of 1944, I was sent to London to be with the OSS. Others were engaged for shorter and longer periods. Political scientists all over the place were taken in during the New Deal and the war. Then, I became one of the officials of the U.N. conference at San Francisco, being relieved of the Department chairmanship during that period.

F. How was that kind of service evaluated at the University or in the Department? Was it valued as something unusual or was it just accepted?

C. My general impression is that it was accepted as something very important which they never, so far as I know, tried to prevent. I think the University was glad that it was done. Partly, of course, it helped solve the problem of an oversupply of faculty during those years. But also, they considered, I think, that it added to the prestige of the University as well as to that of the individual. I think that the administration accepted it and approved it in the cases where it was done.

F. Would it be something considered a plus for promotion within the Department?

C. I think this was included together with the other characterizations; but, on the other hand, there were those on the faculty who perhaps were not invited to do this government service. They just stayed here and did their jobs. We tried to be very careful not to have them discriminated against just because the others were called into the service. I think there was a feeling that you could overrate government or war service because very often, of course, this would be largely accidental.

F. Did the undergraduate program change during the '30s and war years, that is, in setting up the major?

C. Yes, we changed the nature of the American government course deliberately over the years, and I suppose I could say that I was to some extent

responsible for some of these changes, especially for the last one. For a long time, we taught American government as national government in one semester and state government the next semester. After some years, it seemed to some of us that this meant you had to duplicate—you had to do the same thing over again at the beginning of the state government course. You had to talk about the federal system in either case, so we thought we'd economize and make it more efficient by changing it to organization and powers in one semester and functions in another semester. We taught both of these each semester, but this meant that the functions part didn't get nearly as many students as the other. It didn't seem as interesting. I always intended to teach that course myself, but I think I never did. It never became convenient in view of my other work.

F. When undergraduates majored in political science, how many hours did they have to take in that period of the '30s?

C. They'd have majored as juniors, not before that.

F. Did they have to have courses drawn from each of the major fields to get a major, or did they specialize in, say, all American or all international relations?

C. For a long time I don't think we required any specific course of everybody except American government. Other than that, I can't recall that we made any general requirements; our offerings were so few that a major would probably have had something in each area, that is, in the international field and administration field and American government and so on. Later on, we began to specify more exactly and I'm sure you do that even more so now.

F. Did the graduate program training, especially the course of instruction, change during the '30s?

C. We added graduate courses, but during my period it seems to me that the nature of our graduate work, what we expected in general, and the way that it was fulfilled, didn't change very much. And one thing we did have, which we had to abandon, was our weekly seminar attended by the entire faculty and all graduate students. I regretted that change very much because it was not only one of the best methods of graduate instruction, but it was also something for which we were well known.

F. How long did those go? When did they finally terminate?

C. Well, strictly speaking, they lasted an hour, but I think we often ran over.

F. Were they afternoon affairs?

C. They were afternoon affairs, yes. And this meant that we expected every member of the faculty to attend and all the graduate students. We were able

to get quarters, including the whole top floor of what I still call the new Ag Building, which was then unfinished. We had to move around. For a long time we met in the Library, in a room across from the History and Political Science Departmental Library; but after some time, that did not accommodate us, so we moved to the Ag Building which, in turn, was made into offices and became too small for us. As I think I mentioned earlier about my own case, when we were very few, the graduate students reported on their progress and read their finished thesis chapters; I suppose I read virtually every word of my thesis because at that time you could do it. After the number of students increased, we had to cut down on this and give summary reports. Then we began to demand not much more than the subject and a brief statement about it from the master's candidates, but something more substantial from the Ph.Ds. It was an extraordinarily useful procedure, and it meant that every member of the faculty and every graduate student knew what the others were doing.

F. When did this seminar terminate?

C. Even when I was at Southern Illinois University, it continued to be carried on, because I remember when Charlie Hagan was the chairman, he invited me to attend. Sometime in the '70s, it began to be increasingly impracticable and therefore got dropped.

F. The numbers?

C. I suppose it was the enrollments that made it impossible.

F. What was the Department's relation to the College and the University during this period of the '30s and the '40s? Was it independent, permitted pretty much to go its own way aside from budget? Or was there a lot of oversight by the College or the University administration?

C. I would say that the oversight was very slight. We pretty much went our own way. Of course, we in the Department of Political Science were always very conventional and didn't startle the College with anything much. We were so conventional that I myself felt that we needed to perk up a bit and I encouraged the beginning of our attention to behavioralism, for example.

F. Did the Graduate College have oversight in the matter of degrees?

C. Oh yes. I think we have pretty much the same rules now, although I'm not sure I know exactly what they are.

F. I'd like you to move to the people who were new on the faculty during the '30s and the war years and again characterize them, as you did with the people in the '20s.

C. Most of them had been with us in other ways, so that when they came as members of the faculty they knew us and we knew them, and there were no important problems about adjustment that I can think of.

F. How would you characterize Professor Hagan, for example, as a teacher and scholar? Did you have any particular impression of these new men?

C. Hagan was a delightful colleague and I think very much liked by his students. I don't know what more to say about him.

F. How about some of the other men in the Department who were new in the '30s and early '40s?

C. Well, we had Sibley, who was probably the most leftist of any of the faculty, but who really caused no problems along that line. But it became more and more known to the administration and they became somewhat reluctant to do what we thought should be done about promotions and salary. Thus, when he got an offer from Minnesota, I personally didn't feel that I could discourage him from going there. And he's had a much better setup there than we would have been able to provide for him here, at least for some time. Later on, I think we might have been able to do better. There was some of this in the atmosphere of the University at this time, especially in the higher administration, which was pretty conservative for years. While it didn't seriously interfere with our program or operation, I think we all had a feeling that we had to walk a little carefully. There was complete discouragement of political activity, for example, running for office, or taking part in party politics. This gradually changed, so that when Austin Ranney and Jack Peltason came here they began to participate actively in local party activities, and so on, and there was never any feeling against it so far as I know. And it may well be that those of us who were on the faculty in previous years were a little bit fearful when we didn't need to be. But I also remember correspondence with people at other universities about this matter. It wasn't only here, it was also elsewhere. But here, especially in the earlier years under Kinley, there was the fear that a faculty member would not speak as he should if he participated in politics, that he would irritate the legislature, and that this would affect our appropriations. They didn't completely trust us. Kinley didn't completely trust us. He became a totally different man when he retired from the presidency.

F. Who else can you think of from this period?

C. Snider, who came here as a graduate student from Indiana, was an assistant for some time, got his Ph.D. and stayed on. He was a little like Mathews in that he did nothing dramatic, but was an extraordinarily good, steady, reliable

teacher. I might tell you one thing about him that I think is rather interesting. We won the Rose Bowl one year—I don't remember which year it was—and some students went mad about this. The following Monday a student ran through Lincoln Hall, opened the classroom doors, and tried to get the classes dismissed to celebrate the Rose Bowl victory. I happened to be in the hall and saw him open Clyde Snider's door. Clyde had a couple of football players who had come back, and they got up and said, "You get out of here, we want to have class." That's such an unusual proceeding that I had to tell about it. I guess because even the football players liked Clyde Snider so much, this poor fellow didn't get his vacation.

F. Let's move to the period after World War II, the late '40s through the 1950s when you were head. The "new boys" came in, as it were. You were chairman. Behavioralism came on the scene, and there were large enrollments, a lot of money, and expansion of the University. That is, Illinois shared much with higher education around the country. What happened to the Department? What were the things you would point to as the most dramatic changes in the ten or fifteen years after the war?

C. Well, that's a little difficult for me to say. Of course, I'd been too closely connected and it hadn't occurred to me that anything very dramatic had happened. We just changed and added courses, we got more students, we added more faculty. I should, of course, note that Francis Wilson was brought here after Garner's death and he built up the program in political theory extraordinarily well.

F. I noticed the increase in the number of dissertations in political theory.

C. I suppose I was responsible for that because I was the only one, I think, who knew Wilson.

F. How would you characterize him?

C. He was probably our best, or one of our best, scholars, especially in his knowledge of the earlier history of political theory, Latin, and so on. Of course, he turned out to be rather conservative. He was a convert to Catholicism, as was his wife also, and he became more and more Catholic as the years went on, and more and more conservative. It was never a troublesome matter between him and me, although later on I think he felt—and I think, wrongly—that he was being discriminated against by the others. He was a bit of a lonely character. He was somewhat different from the others and I think he imagined a criticism that really wasn't there very much. I don't know how much further to go. I learned to know him personally the year that I was away for fifteen months in Geneva, because he was in Geneva at the

same time studying the labor office. We used to see him occasionally. His wife was with him at the time, but we didn't have very frequent association. He succeeded Charlie Kneier as chairman of the Department and also was acting chairman during the period when I was in London and in San Francisco at the United Nations Conference.

F. I think this is the time for us to move to some of those adventures of yours that you refer to—the work in Geneva and San Francisco. Would you give us a brief history of some of these?

C. I was brought into the State Department group that was working on plans for San Francisco. At that time it wasn't generally good form to apply for anything. I don't remember that I ever did apply for anything myself, but a very close friend of mine was working with the same commission in New York that I was working with. He had been in the secretariat of the League of Nations for ten years and was there, in fact, when I was in Geneva and had helped me a great deal. I became almost a member of the League secretariat and had access to League materials and privileges. This friend had already joined the State Department and he suggested to me that others in that group had been talking about me and wondered if I would come down to Washington. He was very sure that I could make some arrangements, so I took the train to Washington. Before I came back, I was interviewed and offered a full-time position. However, I had just become chairman of the Department and I mentioned this problem and the difficulty there might be, so they agreed immediately to make me a special deal whereby I would come out to Washington and spend a week out of every month. The University agreed to do that, so the arrangement was finalized, and I rode the B&O for two years every month, back and forth.

F. Was that a long trip?

C. Well, at that time the Capitol Limited was an awfully good train and I can't remember that it was ever late. Coming back, I would have to get off at South Chicago early in the morning and take a taxi across to the South Side Illinois Central Station and I never missed it, although the connection was considered a bit risky.

F. This was an overnight train from Washington to Chicago?

C. Oh yes.

F. And did you work consistently in Washington on this arrangement?

C. Yes, I got assignments of various kinds. I worked on the political side and very commonly with this close friend of mine, Ben Gerig, and several others.

The first thing they asked me to do was to draft a covenant for the League of Nations, sufficiently revised to include Russia and the United States. The interesting thing that this indicated to me was that at least this staff was thinking of the possibility of the League continuing and the United States and Russia joining it which, of course, would have been the sensible thing to do if that had been possible. Then I got various other assignments, but always on the political side, which I enjoyed very much. It meant working on various kinds of problems which were, in general, associated with the kinds of problems I had to deal with in the United Nations Conference itself.

F. How about the Conference? What role did you play?

C. I was invited to go there and that was a little bit dramatic. I was called one morning by a friend in the State Department, and asked if I would join the group at the Conference and, of course, I very gladly agreed, but said I would have to consult with the authorities at the University. I saw President Willard and he immediately agreed that I might accept. They had also asked me at the State Department if the University would be willing to pay my salary, or at least part of it, because they didn't have much money. So I raised this question with President Willard and he immediately agreed to pay me half salary. In other words, I was put on leave at half pay and the State Department made up the other half. The State Department paid everybody on the San Francisco staff, that is, the professors. That afternoon Roosevelt died, so for a couple of hours I wasn't sure that the Conference would go on, but it did proceed just as planned. I was told what train to take, but I had no knowledge of my assignment until I got there. As it turned out, I was assistant executive officer of Commission I. The Conference was organized into four commissions. Commission I dealt with a miscellaneous group of items: membership, secretariat, amendments, principles and purposes, and the preamble. Commission II dealt with the assembly; Commission III with the Security Council, and Commission IV with judicial problems and the international court. I was slightly disappointed with my assignment at first. It didn't sound as though it would be very dramatic or politically important. As a matter of fact, it turned out to be one of the best because the veto came in on almost everything we dealt with. In addition to that, I was fortunate in another way. I call it fortunate because, although I was assistant executive officer, my superior, Malcolm Davis, was then the acting director of the Carnegie Endowment. He had to make several trips back to New York to deal with his board on budget and other matters, so I was virtually in charge of Commission I and had much more responsibility than the other assistant executive officers. I was the floor manager for our first commission meeting, as well as for all the other commission meetings. So it was a very interesting assignment.

F. I'd like to hear some of the details, for example, the fight over the definition of membership, where the Soviet Union wanted membership for Byelorussia and the Ukraine, and so on.

C. We on the staff ran the Conference. We had nothing to do with the drafting of the charter, but our work did have interesting aspects. Some bright young man, probably on the State Department staff, thought that the small countries didn't have enough assignments. Some of the representatives from the smaller countries were made chairmen and rapporteurs of the different committees. (We had two committees in Commission I, Commissions II and III had four committees each, and Commission IV had two committees; each of these had their officers from the smaller countries.) But there were many small countries that didn't have any assignments, so someone hit upon the idea of giving each commission an assistant secretary general, chosen from a small country. The assistant secretary general for my commission, Commission I, was Charles Malik, the Lebanese minister to the United States. He was a Ph.D. from Chicago and an extraordinary, gifted man. He came to see me one day when Malcolm Davis was away and I was in charge, and wanted to know what he was to do. He said, "As assistant secretary general, I suppose I'm to assist the secretary general and what are my duties?" I, of course, knew that all that was intended was that he sit on the platform at the meetings, but I couldn't say that to him. I tried to tell him that, of course, we'd like his counsel, his advice, and so on. He saw through all this and we had a very pleasant conversation, but shortly after that I was asked to come to a meeting with Alger Hiss, the secretary general, and Malik was there. He had gone to Alger Hiss and asked him the same question, so Alger called me in and again Malik repeated these questions. He said, "I don't want to have this title unless I do something as assistant secretary general." I was interested that Alger Hiss gave him the same palaver that I had, but in better language than I had used, I'm sure. Malik was still not satisfied, but he accepted the situation and sat on the platform. The mistake was the title. He should have been called vice-chairman. Anybody would accept that title, which means that you just wait until something happens to the chairman and then you preside in his place, and usually that's all. That it was indeed a serious blunder is indicated by the fact that when the Conference was over and the U.N. began publishing its yearbooks—the first yearbook, especially, was a splendid, detailed account of the Conference—whoever edited the yearbook had obviously thought that the title "assistant secretary general" must have been a mistake. The title had been translated into "secretary," so this first yearbook came out with Malik as the secretary of Commission I. I wrote and reminded the editor of the yearbook that no delegate acted as a secretary. We on the staff provided the secretaries and

assistant secretaries, and they kept the records. So there was a mistake in the first place, and then that was translated into a blunder.

F. Was there among the members and staff with whom you came into contact a great sense of excitement that something really significant was shaping up at San Francisco in that spring of 1945?

C. Oh yes, there was that. As time went on, I suppose we on the staff became aware that this might not be as successful as everybody hoped, but, of course, we continued to hope. Our connection with the whole thing was, as far as I was concerned, one of the most interesting and exciting experiences that I've had, as well as one of the most educational. I learned to know these people. You had direct contact with the various delegations, especially those who were particularly assigned to your commission, although this assignment was changed now and then. But it also meant hard work. Without ever being told to do something specific, I would fall into an assignment. As the assistant executive officer, I had to make about three reports every day: a summary report, which was a kind of record that we kept, a press release, and another report similar to a press release. We had to return all these reports every evening to a central office. Margaret Ball, a young political scientist, who was dean of women at Duke when I last knew about her, acted on behalf of the upper office and collected all these reports. Robert Steward of the Fletcher School and I, for some reason or other, became the last ones to collect the reports and turn them over to her. So he and I put the United Nations Conference to bed every night. I mean, we didn't leave until everything was done and this meant, I suppose, that we never left before midnight, and sometimes later than that. On our way back to our hotel, we'd stop at a restaurant and have a ham and eggs supper.

F. Did you keep a record or diary at that time and have you written about these experiences?

C. No, I didn't keep any real diaries. I should have.

F. But did you later write about your experiences?

C. No, I never did, not directly. Others wrote about their particular assignments in articles that were published in the *Review*. I never wrote up this experience specifically. I suppose I've written on the basis of the experience to some extent.

F. Well, moving back from that period to your chairmanship of the Department—that was when?

C. I was the second chairman and served from 1942 to 1948. In a sense, you could almost say I was the first. Garner and Fairlie were heads, but they always

acted as chairmen. I mean, they consulted the rest of us or advised us on everything they did. So theirs were really chairmanships functioning under the title of head. When Fairlie retired, the administration wanted to bring in an outsider and we were worried about that. We didn't know what sort of head this outsider would be. Several people were, in fact, brought in, including one very good possibility. But even Mathews, whom I described as quiet, unassuming, never pushing anything, and never pushing himself, was now the senior professor. And under the statutes the professors were to be consulted on the appointment of a head or chairman. Things happened and we were a little bit worried and even Mathews said we must talk the matter over with the dean. We finally voted to request the chairmanship, so we'd have matters going on as they had been in the past, and we won it. The outside candidates had declined, and this pleased us very much. While it had never been agreed that the seniority rule should prevail, we all wanted Mathews to take the position, and he accepted it and served as chairman during the first year. It was a two-year position under the statutes, but he was away the second summer. He went to his summer home in Michigan, and asked me to be acting chairman in his absence. Soon after that, he sent a letter to me and to the administration resigning the chairmanship. He didn't care for this sort of thing at all, although he did it well. He just wanted to be quietly in his office and write and teach. So I became the chairman, served three terms, and resigned in the middle of the third term. I got the office, you see, in the middle of Mathews' term and resigned in the middle of my last term because I was going on leave. I put this up to the others in the Department and they all agreed that this was the thing to do and they asked me not to resign until shortly before leaving. Charlie Kneier succeeded me and in a sense the seniority rule operated, he being the next in line in terms of rank and service.

F. In your term up through 1948, when this new crew of students, the "GI students," were coming through, did they bring about any changes in the graduate training program and were they a different breed of student?

C. I don't recall any change in the program or in the way in which we handled matters, but it was an extraordinary group of persons that came out of the war and, as I understand it, this was true everywhere. These boys that came to us out of the army were just beyond belief.

F. What qualities did they have?

C. They were anxious to do excellent work and they were of higher quality than was usually expected. You could say this about almost every one of them.

F. I see that their numbers were substantial.

C. It was a real pleasure to have had them, and I am very satisfied that I still get correspondence from some of them.

F. Whom do you recall particularly from that period?

C. I think of Lynwood Holland from Georgia, who wrote a fine thesis on the presidential primary in Georgia, which was published as a book; he has done very well. I've had a letter very recently from another student named Malcolm Parsons; he went to Florida State and has won distinction in the field of administration. He's usually called "Red" Parsons. Donald Johnson, one of my prize students, went immediately to Iowa, where he has remained ever since. Nolan Fortenberry was for many years head of the Department of Political Science at the University of Mississippi and then head at Auburn University in Alabama. There were many others, some not associated with the war. I should like to mention especially some outstanding Chinese students who received their Ph.D.s in the '30s: Ping Tung (now William L. Tung), in many positions under Chiang Kai-shek, but especially vice minister of foreign affairs who negotiated the war-time agreements with the United States, and recently retired from New York University; Hung-ti Chu, who served for many years in and recently retired from the secretariat of the United Nations; and Wei-ping Tsai, most recently the chief representative of Taiwan in Washington and here for our Diamond Jubilee.

F. Were there any changes in the graduate program itself after this period? Were students still pretty much responsible for choosing their own programs, or were they being required to sample around the various fields?

C. Well, it's difficult for me to state the policy on that. We had developed fields more consciously than before and brought to our faculty men who had special fields; therefore, specializing was encouraged.

F. You mentioned that you helped initiate the work in behavioral studies here. Who was involved there?

C. I thought it was time that we did some of this and we brought in Austin Ranney partly for that purpose.

F. Ranney came at what level?

C. I think assistant professor. No, he must have come as an instructor because he came right after receiving his degree from Yale, and at that time it was not customary, as it is now, to give a man an assistant professorship the moment he got his degree. I am sure he was an instructor. By this time, however, the intervening rank of associate had been eliminated by the University, so he very soon became an assistant professor.

C. Yes. I don't recall exactly what—this was too long ago—though I don't believe we provided a course on voting behavior, as such.

F. What other young faculty came in at that time?

C. Jack Peltason came shortly afterwards. Charlie Kneier was chairman at the time and I was in Washington when this occurred, so I wasn't really responsible.

F. I think Robert Salisbury was Jack's first Ph.D.

C. Yes, that's probably correct.

F. How did life in the Department change as a result of that growth of students in the post-war period? And the growth of the faculty?

C. Well, I suppose that as the numbers grew, there was a little less of the close personal relationship that we had before, less of the intimate family feeling. That suggests something that I just now recall. One of the last things I had to do as chairman of the Department was to actually get down on my hands and knees and measure the space in the different offices, a report on the exact space being required by the University. What I learned, I remember, was that when I joined the staff, there were seven full-time faculty members, not counting assistants, and we had six offices. When I did this measuring in 1948, just before I retired as chairman, we had twenty-seven men and seven offices. We had gained one office, but I know that we had lost real space. We had had a big room on the fourth floor of Lincoln Hall, which had originally been a municipal reference library and then Story's office. It was the largest room we had, but we traded it for a smaller room on the third floor, resulting in a loss of space over those twenty-four years.

F. And, of course, your classes became larger—both graduate and undergraduate?

C. My own, especially, became larger.

F. What courses were you teaching by this time?

C. John Fairlie turned over his political parties to me and, after a couple of years, I revived the international organization course that Pitman Potter had begun. The political parties course was originally a one-semester, two-hour course. I made it, first, a three-hour course and, eventually, a two-semester, three-hour course, and the administration accepted all these changes. A similar development happened with the international organization course. What this meant was that I usually taught one of those courses. And I always taught a section of American government.

F. It is noticeable that there is a historical stream in this Department, that runs from you through Ranney to Lester Seligman, of interesting publication and study in the field of the American political party.

C. Although Ranney, of course, didn't have my courses in political parties until I retired.

F. Now, when was that?

C. Well, he left before that, so he never did really have the political parties field, but he did do some behavioral or elections work. I don't now recall precisely what.

F. With the increase in the number of faculty, did you have to change your recruitment procedures? Did you still rely simply on letters from faculty of other universities, or did you have any candidates come in?

C. During my period, we brought some people in. Francis Wilson came here and gave an extraordinarily good lecture, so there was immediate satisfaction with him. He stayed at my house, in fact. He was here probably two to four days. I suppose we were doing more of that than I can remember exactly. It certainly wasn t done very much by us for any rank except full professor, and my impression is that this was the general system in the University but, of course, I may be wrong.

F. When you left the chairmanship in 1948, was it still pretty much expected that your colleagues would engage in research and scholarship and publication?

C. Oh yes, we always had that expectation! There were those who didn't do much.

F. Did they require much of the teaching ability of new young faculty before they were hired?

C. Well, we'd get some impression of their competence from their teachers and associates. I remember very well the situation when we were considering Ranney, for example. Frank Coker was at Yale and Ranney was his protégé. I knew Coker extremely well and we'd had correspondence about Ranney. I was satisfied with Ranney and I was anxious to make an appointment, but I couldn't get the administration of the College to act. One day, Coker called me up and simply said, "If you want Ranney, you must act, because he's getting other offers." He said he'd like to place him with us. I brought this immediately to the dean and he was now willing to make a commitment. We made the arrangements then and there, although I hadn't yet seen Ranney

and I can't now recall whether he did any teaching at Yale or not. As for the graduate students, as we got more and more of them we began to need more teaching assistants. At one time we had at least twelve half-time assistants. We felt that it would be a good thing for a student to have some teaching experience as an assistant before taking the Ph.D., but that during his last year he ought to have a fellowship in order to work full time on his thesis. We never encouraged that delaying of the thesis which became a part of the whole system later on.

F. Did Phillip Monypenny and Bob Scott come in during the period that you were there?

C. Francis Wilson and I both saw Bob Scott. He was a Northwestern man, but he had moved with a Latin American specialist to Wisconsin, so he got his degree there. I saw him at a meeting of the American Political Science Association, but he was never brought to Urbana. And I'm quite sure that Francis saw him also. But we didn't do anything else about Bob, such as requiring him to come for interviews with other members of the Department. This was similarly the case with others; we commonly arranged simply to see them during the Association meetings.

F. As the Department got larger in the period of your chairmanship (twenty-seven persons, I think you mentioned), was there the same sense of small-group collegiality that had operated before, or did that change?

C. I could detect the beginning of a change before I retired.

F. What form did it take?

C. There were a few who seemed to resent the weekly seminar. They weren't interested in other people's work. There were some who came to the seminar because they thought they were expected to, but really didn't care about it. I began to notice that students and faculty were interested in their own line and not in anybody else's. I always regretted this very much. And then, things happened with the graduate students. They increased in number and I can't say very much more. I didn't know very much about their association with one another in the later years.

F. Let's pick up with the period after you left the chairmanship—what was the next stage? Did you stay here, or did you go to Washington?

C. I was in Washington the year that Truman was elected and I saw him and Barkley when they came back to Washington after the election—it was just before inauguration. Evelyn and I were there during that striking election period.

F. And what were you doing there?

C. I was doing research in the Library of Congress, especially on the party system in Congress. I was interested in that very much and I had good friends. I'd been on the Library staff and that gave me an advantage that lasted a long, long time. I had much easier access and much faster recognition and quicker assignment of a study and this kind of thing.

F. There were some interesting books on the presidency and Congress coming out about that time—let's see, Wilfred Binkley and his *President and Congress*, for example.

C. Binkley was my student at Ohio State the summer that I was there.

F. I knew him in his later years—charming man. He worked every summer for years during the 1930s in the library at Ohio State, putting together what was eventually his book on parties.

C. I might relate one very interesting advantage I did have in Washington at this time: I was working on the party caucuses in Congress and I discovered that the *New York World* had the best accounts. I had trouble getting the minutes or the records of the caucuses. I did get those for the House for both parties without much trouble and I could tell something about that, but that will do for the moment. But I also learned that those caucus records had very little substance beyond being largely just a record of the formal transactions and of resolutions that were adopted. I was anxious to get the *New York World* and I learned that the *St. Louis Post Dispatch* had acquired the *New York World* over this period and I went to the *Post Dispatch* offices. Somebody had gone through the *New York World* over a long period of time, clipped those portions that were the Washington correspondence which told about the operations of the caucuses, and had pasted those clippings into a book. They had this in the *Post Dispatch* office. There I was given a desk, or I sat at a table with Marquis Childs, Charlie Ross, and all those fine *Post Dispatch* people. I learned to know some of them very well indeed, and used those *New York World* clippings, which were excellent accounts of the caucus proceedings. I don't now remember the exact period covered, but it was a long time.

F. So you were there during academic year 1948-49, and then came back here?

C. Yes.

F. And what did you teach when you came back? Were you still teaching parties?

C. Oh, I taught the same things until I retired. I taught political parties and international organization. That's what we called it, but it was essentially a

course on the League of Nations until the U.N. was established and then it became a U.N. course. I also continued to teach American government.

F. That decade of the 1950s, according to the figures, saw an enormous growth in graduate work at the University of Illinois. Where there had been a total of about twelve Ph.D.s produced in political science in the 1940s, the war years, in the 1950s, there were forty-three and in the next decade, the '60s, there were sixty-three Ph.Ds. Of course, the number of Master's degrees was much larger. So one gets a sense of great growth.

C. That's much greater than I would have remembered. I had a good many of those students myself. In general, they were pretty well distributed, I think.

F. One of the things that the Department record shows is the increasing spread of these degrees across the fields of the discipline. In the earlier decades, they had been primarily in American government and international relations, and that was pretty much true through the period of the 1930s. Then they began to spread a little bit more into theory, comparative, and public policy, and by the '50s, almost all of these fields have Ph.D.s. By the '60s, there were degrees appearing in behavior. So there was a diversification as well as a total increase in number.

C. We had developed more courses, but we never did this to any considerable extent. We were, on the whole, a very conventional group; we made very cautious reviews and additions, and I suppose we weren't equipped for some of these newer fields. We'd been together a long time and I suppose that we didn't feel the need for this development as much as we perhaps should have.

F. Who were some of the new faculty who came in during the 1950s? Earlier we mentioned two of these—Ranney and Peltason. Do you recall some of the others who might have come in at that time?

C. Yes, Ed Lewis, Phil Monypenny and Bob Scott were my own appointments. Scott was my last. Phil was appointed without a visit or interview. We very much needed an addition in the area of administration, and he was strongly recommended by the Minnesota group. At that time he was in Puerto Rico, I think. So we got him without ever seeing him and he certainly did splendidly—built up the work in administration. Later on, I brought Robert Connery from Stanford. He was originally a Columbia man and was brought to my attention by people like Lindsay Rogers and Arthur McMahon whom I knew very well at Columbia. He did make us a visit and accepted an offer to come here. This was at the time of the establishment of the Institute of Government and Public Affairs, which is a long and complicated story by itself.

F. Were you involved in any part of that?

C. I was chairman of the Department when the Institute was announced. We had never been told that it was going to be established nor was our opinion of it solicited.

F. The Department did not vote on the matter?

C. Oh, we had nothing to do with it at all. We were simply told. Information was deliberately withheld; there's no question about it. There had been reason to think that something along that line might be done and, in fact, even Garner and Fairlie had asked for appropriations so that something in the nature of public service could be set up to do some of the things that the Institute has done. Garner and Fairlie had also asked for a budget for this purpose and when I became chairman, I included their budget requests on my own. There began to be rumors about something of this sort developing, so we prepared for it. We thought we should. I asked Charlie Kneier to draft some sort of proposal or program and he produced a pretty good one, I think, assuming it would be in our own Department. But nothing happened at all. There were various statements out of Springfield by some legislator who said it was time to have some work in government at the University of Illinois. And my friends at the University Club would kid me about this, you see.

F. What did they think you had been doing all these years?

C. These things eventually established a kind of rumor, and so I finally went to Provost Coleman Griffith, who was presumably a very close friend of mine, and said we'd at least like to know what was going on. In my presence, he dictated a statement which he signed and gave me a copy of at the time, saying that nothing would be done without consulting the Department. I think it was probably a week or ten days later that the Institute was announced. All this meant in relation to Bob Connery was that he had accepted a position at the same time that Gray, who was made director of the Institute, was trying to set up two positions, one in administration and one in international relations. It turned out that he was bringing a man here at the same time that Bob Connery was coming. In fact, the first man he brought here was Herbert Simon, who was then at the Technical Institute in Chicago. Of course, we hadn't been told he was coming; we just learned that from Simon himself. In fact, he made two trips down here and he asked to talk with us, which was a little bit difficult and embarrassing. We didn't want to stop anything there or give the impression that we did, so I simply had to tell him that we had nothing to do with it, but we'd welcome him if he came. In the end, he refused to come because he wanted a position in the Department as well as in the Institute, which those in the Institute wouldn't allow.

A second man, and this was Jim Fesler, my close friend at North Carolina, was brought here, again without our knowledge until he came. He would have

been here at the same time as Bob Connery, in fact, except for an unexpected change. Bob had to postpone his coming for a few days for some reason. So neither knew about the other. Jim Fesler, of course, came to see us. Again, I expressed my pleasure that he might come and told him that we would have as close relations as possible, but I couldn't give him anything in the Department. I wasn't authorized to do anything about it. But in the end he accepted, and his wife came here to hunt for a house.

Then the question arose about his salary. He was being given a much better salary than anybody in the Department of Political Science. Henning Larsen, dean of the College at that time, felt that the Institute belonged in the College and insisted on having something to do with it, so the question of Jim Fesler's salary came to him. Gray insisted that it was a twelve-month salary, which some faculty members had, and therefore it was justifiably better than ours and the others on ten-month appointments. President Stoddard and Henning Larsen, who was quite stubborn, and all the others insisted that it was for ten months. They refused to approve Fesler at the twelve-month salary. All this was happening while his wife was here, so he wired her to come home.

Bob Connery came and stayed a year. Then he got a very fine offer from Duke. Bob had done a lot of work in New York while he was at Columbia. He was virtually a deputy mayor under Wagner and his offer at Duke gave him the guarantee of the right to engage in this kind of political activity. We couldn't do that for him. I couldn't get enough from the administration to be able honestly to urge him not to accept the offer. I hoped that he'd stay, but I couldn't use much pressure on him, and in the end he was here just a year.

Well, that caused a big blow-up in the Institute. Gray had to resign and it occurred just at the time that my own resignation was announced, so I'm sure that many people in the community thought that I was also being forced to resign.

F. This was what year now?

C. 1948.

F. You resigned the chairmanship?

C. We had talked about it and agreed at least a year before that this should happen, but my colleagues felt that I shouldn't submit it or make it official until very near the end, which is what I did.

F. On another professional matter—in the 1950s, what were the national meetings like compared to what they had been?

C. They became noticeably larger and larger so that we not only met by ourselves, but also began to have some hotel problems. Sometimes we had to use

two hotels, something I didn't like nearly so much because it meant that many of my friends were at another hotel and I didn't see them. Friends and colleagues were more difficult to see, the program became more complex, and so forth. I've never been as happy with the Association as I was when it was smaller.

F. The regional meetings are a different thing. They're really much more companionable because of the smaller size. Did the regional meetings go back prior to World War II? I remember attending one of the first ones in Indianapolis after World War II.

C. I don't remember the year they began. They began with the meeting at Turkey Run, a park in Indiana.

F. Before or after World War II?

C. It must have been before; I ought to remember the year but I can't.

F. The regional meetings seem to have retained their small size and easy companionship.

C. No, they grew so much that they couldn't use the Indiana parks anymore. When we met at the parks, it was perfectly delightful. There were at the same time, of course, those who wanted to go to a bigger city. They liked to be able to get around and see things and have what they called a good time. During those years, too, most of the sessions were plenary sessions and I personally liked that. Of course, I recognize that that's not possible anymore in view of the numbers who attend. You can have an occasional plenary session, but you have to divide them up. But these regional meetings have also become much more complex, crowded, and so on. I have great difficulty in finding a program that suits me. Not that there are not such panels, but it's such a large and complicated program that you have to hunt for what you want and you didn't have to do that at the beginning. John Senning from Nebraska, one of our own Ph.Ds, drove all the way from Lincoln, Nebraska to Turkey Run to complain that Nebraska was not included in the Midwest. He thought it should have been and, of course, we welcomed him. In sending invitations to this first meeting, a rough decision had been made that institutions within an area of around 300 miles be included, so he hadn't gotten a formal invitation. I remember that very well as being indicative of the uncertain limits of what we called the Midwest.

F. A trip like that on those roads in the 1930s was no small matter either. Now on a different subject: You earlier mentioned the creation of the Institute; was the University also involved in other matters related to the Department?

C. Well, we established divisions within the College, although they were not the same thing as what are now called schools. I suppose I could claim to have

had something to do with that development. What happened was that the biological sciences had some problems among the several departments. An excellent man, Professor Halvorson, was brought from Minnesota to head this area, and at the same time a division of the biological sciences was established in order to bring these different departments together and help solve some of the problems. The administration wanted to bring some of these related matters together under this rather masterful fellow, I think. That having been done, some time later I rose in the Senate, called attention to this divisional arrangement, and suggested that perhaps the question of other divisional organizations ought to be studied, especially for the social sciences. I made no formal proposal, but the suggestion seemed to take hold and the heads of the Departments of Political Science, History, Economics, and Sociology were asked to consider the matter and make a recommendation. Well, they did and recommended that a committee be set up to study the matter further and make a formal proposal, and I suppose because I had made the original suggestion I was named chairman of that committee. We drafted a charter for a social science division, and composed that division in a somewhat unusual way. We included the Departments of Political Science, History, and Sociology; also, at this time Geology and Geography were a department together and we included the geography section of that department in the division, as well as the Department of Economics in the College of Commerce. The committee also wanted to include the College of Law. In fact, George Goble of the College of Law was on the committee and he wanted very much to have Law included, but couldn't persuade his colleagues. They thought that the College of Law—maybe it was still called the Law School—was an entity by itself, and they didn't want to be included with these lesser entities. Our charter was accepted, and I was appointed the first chairman, with a statutory term of two years. I served two terms and, as the first chairman of this division, I had to take the lead in organizing it and had to make reports to both the dean of the College of Liberal Arts and the dean of the College of Commerce. The creation of this Division of Social Sciences was followed by the creation of similar divisions for other areas in the College, a Division of Humanities, and a Division of Languages and Literature. They all had advisory powers only, and were similarly, though not identically, organized.

F. What was the time period in which these existed?

C. The Division of Social Sciences was set up in 1935. I was the chairman from '35 to '39.

F. How long did the division concept last?

C. I don't know when it disappeared.

F. Was it still in effect when you retired?

C. Oh yes, and when I came back from Southern Illinois University in 1967, it was still going and I doubt that it's ever been formally disestablished. It's just been forgotten, I think. And now, of course, they've established the schools. When I learned about the School of Social Sciences being established, I wondered what was happening and wrote a note to the dean, reminding him that we already had these divisions. I don't remember the exact nature of his reply, except that he seemed to know nothing about the divisions. I do not, of course, mean to suggest that they should not have been replaced by the more powerful schools, though that may be debatable.

F. What was the year of your retirement?

C. My active retirement from the University of Illinois was in 1958; my legal retirement was in 1961. Southern Illinois University requested my services and asked that my retirement be postponed. This was worked out since SIU is on the same retirement system. It meant that for three more years, I was carried on the rolls there as a professor on leave without pay, something which was of tremendous importance to me. I was at the point where I'd received several offers as my retirement was coming on and I was about to accept a position at Franklin and Marshall College in Pennsylvania. That is a very interesting place, scenically beautiful, and there were some very interesting things going on there at the time, but had I accepted that offer and gone there, I'd have had to retire on the old pension. What had happened was that the legislature had revised the pension system advantageously and the governor had vetoed it—I think I'm right about this. So that those who retired in 1957, the year before I did, had to retire on the old system. But it was well known that the legislature would pass a new bill, or had passed it, and the governor's signature was pledged. That better pension system became effective for me in view of my retirement being postponed, and my pension was almost doubled. It still isn't very big. Southern Illinois University did that for me by approaching me when they did, which was at the Midwest meeting in Ann Arbor. I was president of the Midwest that year also, and it was a very special occasion because colleagues gave me a nice party up there.

F. When did they have the festivities here on your retirement?

C. It was in 1958. But this meant, you see, that I stayed on the rolls for three more years and then I was advised that I couldn't get any more advantages. So I formally retired in 1961, but continued as a visiting professor at SIU until 1967.

F. And Southern Illinois is where you had as your student the present ambassador to the United Nations, Donald McHenry?

C. Yes, he was a graduate student of mine at Southern Illinois University. I think he was probably in two of my courses, both the one in international organization and the political parties course.

F. I'm going to ask you some other kinds of questions that require you to summarize impressions about particular aspects of life gained over a period of time. For example, what do you think is still common in the life of the Department, that was there through the decades of your experience, or was there when you retired?

C. My own feeling is that it's changed very considerably, but that feeling may be mostly due to my own attitude. I haven't tried to make acquaintance with the new people, although I have learned to know most of them. In fact, I have felt that as an "old hand," who had much to do with Departmental matters over the years, I ought to remove myself from participation. I must say that I have been treated most generously.

F. Let's restrict this just to the period when you retired, up to 1958. What do you think was much the same, if anything?

C. I think that it remained pretty much the same, although we had increasing complexities and problems due mostly to growth. And, of course, with the growth we acquired more staff and more different types of people—I couldn't name anybody specific and I probably wouldn't if I could. I don't mean to say that they were difficult, but they were different. They developed other kinds of work which I personally had to get used to. I was never opposed to new developments. I was always in favor of expanding these matters, but, well, I suppose there was just much less of a feeling of a family. This is what Garner always emphasized—a family. We were always just a small group and constantly with him, and so forth. I don't think I can put it any other way.

F. Could you evaluate the Department's standing in the discipline over the period of time you were here?

C. It had a very high rating. Here at the University, we were acknowledged to be one of the four best departments. Sometime in the 1920s or '30s, we were rated and turned out to be one of the starred departments as rated throughout the profession, so we had a very high reputation in general. I couldn't say just when this began to go down, but it probably began to decline as the numbers increased noticeably and there were more and more people who wanted to do things in different ways. Garner, for example, was troubled a little bit by one person who automatically forgot to come to our weekly seminar. Garner would send for him and he'd come down and be very apologetic, but we knew very well he just didn't care to come. He was that much interested in his own

particular line and uninterested in anybody else's. But at that time he was definitely an exception, and didn't stay with us very long.

F. How would you compare the graduate students then and now?

C. This is terribly difficult to assess, I should say, but they are probably not much different. Of course, the number of assistants grew. I use the term assistants, you use the term "T.A." I discovered when I came back from Southern Illinois University that there was the new term, which we didn't really need to use, because an assistant to us, in my time, meant teaching assistant and nothing else. We had no assistants for research or for anything but teaching. During the war we began to get a little bit of research assistance through the NYA. I had one assistant who compiled a good deal of stuff for me on political party platforms and this kind of thing. Otherwise, we never had any of this at all. As the number of these grew and, of course, the need grew, we probably didn't scrutinize them as carefully as you now do.

F. Do you think that during the period of time you were here there was any change in the quality of the graduate student program?

C. Yes. It definitely improved after the war when we got the GI's, eager and excellent, a situation we hoped would continue. But it didn't. As these people got their degrees, a new lot came in. They proved to be much the same as students had been before. There were some very good ones, but more--at least so we felt—who were less well-qualified.

F. Let's see if some specific events stick with you. Let's assume that we have a time machine sitting right here in this room that could take you anywhere back into your past. What single day in your professional life as a faculty member would you like that machine to recall?

C. Well, I had some rather unusual experiences in Geneva, because I was there at the time of the Manchurian affair. I was able to attend every meeting of the League of Nations Council on that affair, except those in Paris from 1931 to 1932. And I also attended the disarmament conference which began in February 1932.

F. So you wouldn't pick a day, you'd like to pick a year.

C. Then there were the experiences at the United Nations Conference and, perhaps especially, those in London during the war, in the summer of 1944. But in terms of the closer associations with my own colleagues in political science, I suppose that I'd go back to the report of the APSA Committee on Political Parties in 1950. I was involved in this both as a member of the committee and also as a member of the drafting committee. That was an

extremely interesting experience. We really operated over a period of four years. For at least two years, Louise Overacker and I carried on an active correspondence because we were assigned the problem of party membership and although the committee didn't meet during this time, the members carried on correspondence. In that way we were able to make considerable progress when we did meet as a committee.

F. Looking back on that 1950 report, "Toward More Responsible Political Parties," do you have the feeling that your tentative predictions or fears have been realized?

C. I've been very much interested that Richard Strout of the *Christian Science Monitor*, writing as TRB in the *New Republic*, has renewed an interest in that report. He always had it. He was one of our very good friends from the start, welcomed that report and commented on it, and has now begun to renew his interest in it and in other similar situations. He recently referred, for example, to a plan by Congressman Reuss of Wisconsin which seemed to be somewhat similar in some features to this 1950 report. So I actually wrote the other day to Congressman Reuss, asking if I could get a copy of his plan. The impression I get, and from which I get a good deal of satisfaction, is that our 1950 report is not really outdated. I don't think it's outdated and a man like Richard Strout considers it very up-to-date. It makes recommendations which are very much needed to restore the parties. That brings me back to the period when we drafted this report; it was a most interesting period for me to sit with this committee because the full committee did meet several times—I don't remember now how many times. We had almost no money, so it couldn't have been often. But when we got into the drafting stage, those of us on the drafting committee met quite often, usually at our own expense. Our draft report had to be accepted by the full committee, which meant that there were some compromises in order to make it a group report. At the same time, individual members made their own special contributions which were adopted and which satisfied me very much. We were aware, of course, that we needed to be cautious in our recommendations, and we didn't go as far as Richard Strout, for example, who is fascinated with the parliamentary system and refers to it all the time. The report makes certain steps towards that parliamentary system, but not many. We discussed that at the beginning; there were those who wanted to have full discussion of that system as an alternative possibility, but most of us felt that to be quite unnecessary. I'm personally taken with the parliamentary system and would like it immediately, but I know that it's completely unrealistic to consider it seriously. Most of us on the committee felt that serious consideration in the report would diminish the regard for the report. We were determined to have our feet on the ground and make recommendations that might have some chance of adoption by the parties.

F. And yet, just this month in the *Foreign Affairs* magazine, Lloyd Cutler, an old Washington hand, has come out with a call for reconsidering the parliamentary government model of the United States, given the difficulties of the Executive and Congress and governing.

C. I hope to know more about what he thinks; it sounds very interesting, and does suggest, as does Richard Strout, that the 1950 report may still be applicable and deserving of renewed consideration.

F. The reaction of members of the Association to that report was quite interesting. It wasn't simply published; it was something on which you held panel sessions in the Association convention, as I recall.

C. We felt that there should be opportunity for comment and criticism, so we urged that a panel be set up the next meeting year deliberately for this purpose. The committee was reorganized and persons were added who were suspicious and inclined to be critical. I think, in general, that they became more pleased with it as they got involved in it. Then one of our political scientists published an article which was definitely critical, Ranney began his criticism of it, and so on. The committee lacked a budget. We intended to have hearings on the report before its publication with all kinds of groups, and we staged one dinner in Washington. We had hoped to have dinner meetings, especially with leading congressmen, but this we could not do because we lacked the money. At the one dinner we had, however, there were representatives of various special interests: labor, League of Women Voters, a number of groups of that kind. I can't name them all. We had a very interesting discussion. But we ran completely out of money, so in order to circulate the draft report, we on the drafting committee paid for it. I think we each contributed $25.

F. Was this the only time the Association issued a report as an association on a public policy matter?

C. No, there was a precedent for this in a committee on Congress, of which George Galloway was chairman. That committee was pretty well financed through Ben Wallace, whose brother gave money to *Readers' Digest*. They got out an exceptionally good report on Congress. That was just a few years ahead of ours—I don't remember exactly when. There were those who questioned whether the Association should make this kind of report. The Association never voted to approve or disapprove. I thought it should, since we were an Association committee. I thought it should be submitted to the business meeting and discussed. It was probably very much better that it was not. I don't think we'd have gotten formal approval from a majority in a business

meeting. The Association simply accepted it as a report of the committee and published it as a report of the committee.

F. In the late '60s, when there was an enormous amount of controversy within the Association over the Vietnam War, civil rights, and other matters, the national council was under great pressure to take a stand on the war. They resisted it, so it became a matter of a vote. Some thought this would break tradition, and at one point there was a reference made to these earlier APSA reports. But it was clear that they had not really been endorsed, as it were, by the Association.

C. No, they really weren't. They were published and that, of course, implied to many people that it was an endorsement. That it was good enough to publish is all I can say for it.

F. May I ask you a personal question? Who was the political scientist who most influenced your own thinking?

C. Well, of course, Garner and Fairlie, with whom I grew up here and who were different from one another and yet had extraordinary prestige. Other than that, perhaps Arthur Holcombe, whom I learned to know extremely well—I had a lot of association with him. But then, I also knew Frank Coker and Walter Shepard.

F. How did you react to the changing emphasis in fields of study, as the years went by?

C. I think I'm one who tends to accept situations as they arise without thinking much about them. I don't know if that's a fair assessment of myself at all. I find it very difficult to say. I could say this, though—I could never develop any considerable interest in political theory. I just took the courses and the examinations that I needed. It's the one subject that I never taught.

F. I gather that you didn't talk about this with Francis Coker.

C. My own feeling is that it's a little bit overdone now, which may be completely wrong.

F. In what way is that?

C. Well, there are more and more courses in political theory, and more and more interests represented. I don't want to argue the matter at all, but I'm just not attracted to it, either as a subject or as a useful tool. I don't care much for theory. I like to see how things operate and so I was and am institution-minded. That's where I get great pleasure—developing courses in international organization or the League of Nations and United Nations. I like

to see those institutions studied and, of course, the institutions of American government. I don't understand what seems to me to be a considerable lack of interest in American government. It's more and more difficult to get people with higher degrees to teach those courses. They do it unwillingly, it seems to me. That began in my own time. One of our sources of pride here was that almost every man in the Department had a hand in American government. This wasn't universal, of course, nor could it last. Fairlie didn't belong in that large course because people couldn't hear him, and Garner soon developed his own field of international law. After that, he couldn't take the time for American government, but he had lectured in that area for many years.

F. This Department in the last two years has returned to the practice of having the senior professors teach a section of American government.

C. I've seen that and I approve of it very highly.

F. Who was the public figure whom you most admired?

C. Among the more recent, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Paul Douglas.

F. Now, do you say that as a Democrat or a political scientist?

C. I took part in an evaluation that we political scientists made of members of the Senate at one time, and Paul Douglas was chosen as the most outstanding member of the Senate. More of us knew him personally than anybody else.

F. What were the qualities in these three men you mentioned, that made you admire them the most?

C. I don't think the fact that they were Democrats had anything to do with it. Many people wouldn't believe me on that; they wouldn't think that I had that much objectivity. Truman was very attractive, especially in relation to this report on political parties, because had he continued as president, many of the proposals we suggested would have been made effective. He was for the report and made that plain. Bert Gross was the executive secretary of the Council of Economic Advisers under Truman and was a member of our committee and became the chairman of the reorganized committee. He didn't last very long because he also became the research director for the Democratic National Committee and then he felt he ought to resign from our committee. But he had that connection with Truman and Truman thought very highly of him and through him became familiar with our report and very much in favor of it.

F. Did he talk with members of the Association about that report?

C. I never personally talked to Truman about the report, but it was brought to him especially through Bert Gross and also through Charlie Ross, his press secretary, whom I knew personally and saw frequently. There were certainly others who probably had a chance to talk with Truman about it.

F. What were the other qualities possessed by these men whom you admired?

C. It is a hard question to answer. I never sat down and talked with Franklin Roosevelt as many of my colleagues had done, but I did hear him on several very dramatic occasions. This was something of an experience. When I was on leave in 1940, and the Pan-American Scientific Congress was meeting in Washington at that time, President Willard asked me to be a delegate, and so I attended those meetings more or less officially. The American Society of International Law was also meeting at that time, and then the Germans invaded the low countries. President Roosevelt was scheduled to speak to this conference one evening—it was the evening of the day on which the Germans had begun the invasion. Roosevelt's speech turned towards that and it was something I shall never forget. I wish I could describe the situation; it was very dramatic.

F. If you had to be without human contact for the rest of your life, are there any two or three books on the study of politics that you'd like to have with you to reread?

C. I should be able to answer that, but I can't.

F. There have been so many books in the seventy years of your activity and concern and interest in the study of politics, I'm not surprised. You have kept very active in the twenty-two years since your retirement from here. Do you want now to sketch in some of the things that you have done besides the Southern Illinois appointment?

C. Well, what I really have been doing all the time is about the same thing I always did, except meet classes. I maintain a study in the library and try to go there every afternoon. I share an office, as you know, with Ira Carmen. I am usually there in the morning, do my correspondence and other routine matters. I regret that I can't offer any assurance that anything important will come out of this; I'm a little worried that perhaps nothing will. For some time I've been going over an accumulation of papers of one kind or another, that I haven't quite been able to throw away. It seemed to me rather important to maintain and classify these papers properly, and so I've done very little actual writing. I have written at least one, and usually two or three, book reviews each year. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science has

for some time sent me books for review, so I've had to write those. Some of the books have been very interesting, especially those on political figures like Lyndon Johnson, Judge Sirica, Richard Nixon, Gerry Ford, and so on. But I'm still hoping that a large project will result. I've got a number of unfinished chapters—that is, they were finished some time ago, in a sense, and they should have been published at that time—but so much has happened since, that they have to be very considerably revised and added to now. At one time, I really had intended to write a detailed history of the development of the national convention and other features of our party system, but several things happened to throw me off that project at the time. A second phase of the Committee on Political Parties was established after we had gotten out the first report, and I continued as a member and as chairman of the subcommittee on the national convention. We worked hard and made quite a good deal of progress on that. Paul David, who is in Springfield this year, was one of the members of that committee, so he and I had a good deal of correspondence. Then we were suddenly cut off, that is, not just my subcommittee, but the main Committee on Political Parties. We never knew exactly what happened. V.O. Key was the chairman of the committee when it was abolished, so it couldn't have been the lack of prestige—Key was as good as anybody could imagine. He was surprised by the fact that we were suddenly ordered to stop.

F. Well, let me thank you, Clarence, for sharing your recollections over a long period of time. Thank you for the Department, and for the others to come down the line, who will be reading this. Like you, I hope we get together a proper history of the Department at some time. So we are all grateful for your contribution to the beginning of a history here.

C. I appreciate your giving me this opportunity.

Interview with Neil F. Garvey

by Thomas Page

This interview was conducted between Neil Garvey and Thomas Page on November 4, 1981. A portion of the interview which detailed Professor Garvey's first career in public school teaching and administration has been omitted.

N. . . . . Around the first of October [1939], I got a call from Bob Browne, who was the director of the Extension Division down here. He told me that they had just entered into an agreement with the U.S. Office of Education to employ a state forum counselor. The U.S. commissioner at that time was John Studebaker, who had a brilliant record as superintendent of schools at Des Moines and had done a lot of work with the public forum there. He was trying to develop this on a nationwide basis. There were, I think, eighteen states that were going along with him on an experiment. The various universities employed the counselor for a temporary period of not more than one year. Well, that was all right in my situation, so I took it. Royden Dangerfield was tied in with that work in a different capacity than I was. The plan called for groups of communities to go together jointly to set up public forums, and there was a stable of forum leaders that went from place to place to lead discussion groups on selected public topics.

T. This sounds a little like a derivative of the Chautauqua idea, but concentrated in the public affairs area rather than in the broad literary and entertainment fields.

N. It was, but it had more central control. Now, Royden's position—I don't remember the geographical area that he was in—was that of resource leader within one of those clusters.

T. Here in Illinois, you mean?

N. No, not in Illinois. We couldn't sell the cluster idea in this state. Not very many states bought it. There were several that continued this program with few centralized controls on into the second year. I recall Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, New York, and Missouri, but I can't name the others. I didn't know all of the forum directors of all these states. The man at Wisconsin and the one

at Michigan and I got very well acquainted. Wisconsin had developed another marvelous program before this one had started—an out-of-state program for first voters.

T. Isn't that something from the La Follette period in Wisconsin? It sounds familiar to me.

N. It was named the Manitowoc Plan, after the town where it was first established by a fellow named J.R. Colbert, I guess it was.

T. Now, let's go back. Did you stay a second year in that appointment with Bob Browne?

N. Yes, that would have been 1940-41. During the second year I got involved in trying to set up a first-voter program like Wisconsin had. We had a good statewide committee set up for this. The president of Western Illinois University was chairman of that committee. We needed a handbook to educate voters on election procedures, so Dick Browne at Normal, Bill Wood of Eastern, and I wrote this up. As it turned out, I did practically all the work. We entitled it *Your Business as a Voter*. We finally got it adopted in the spring of '41 by this committee. Unfortunately, there was a big sleet storm on the day of the meeting and neither Dick nor Bill got here. They intended to point out to the committee that I had done all the work and that their names should not appear on it as co-authors. Well, I wasn't about to claim all the credit, so this was published under the joint authorship of the three of us.

During that time, I had worked with Charles Kneier and Clarence Berdahl of the Political Science Department, and when the handbook was published, they distributed it to all the members of their beginning classes in American government.

Then federal funds were cut, so we couldn't continue with it for the next year. At this time, I decided to go ahead for my doctorate. I had taken graduate work towards such a degree during summer sessions at the University of Chicago and amassed about a year's worth of credits there. I raised a question at the Illinois College of Education about transferring these credits and completing a doctorate here, but was advised this was not possible as graduate credits were not transferable.

Then I decided to do my work in another field—political science. The interesting thing is that when I conferred with my adviser, Charles Kneier, I found that I would have no trouble at all about a transfer of my credits from Chicago to Illinois.

Since there was a change in fields of work, I would need to start from the level of the Master's degree to evaluate all graduate courses applicable. In this process I could use only one Illinois course in school administration and

enough education courses from Chicago to give me a minor in education, along with enough work in educational administration for a second minor in public administration.

T. You had courses in public administration by that time?

N. My work both here and at Chicago had included work in school administration. The course at Chicago was a particularly good, solid course. One course here was under Charles Chadsey, an early dean of education. Anyway, when I shifted to Illinois for the doctorate in political science, I retained practically all of my Chicago credits transferred down here. At Chicago I had some pretty solid public administration under Reavis. I had work in school law under Edwards who had graduate degrees both in philosophy and law and taught with the case method.

T. Well, that would have pleased Charlie Kneier, then. When did you begin doctoral study here? In the fall of '41?

N. I started my program that summer with one course only, under Francis Wilson, and then began a regular schedule in the fall with three courses. In the spring of '42, people were starting to leave the University.

T. The war?

N. Yes. Louis Peterson, who was in charge of correspondence courses and visual aids in Extension got an army commission and left. So Bob Browne asked to have me come back and to take over visual aids. He brought in another man from the Philosophy Department to take over the correspondence courses.

T. I'm trying to figure your age at this time—you were in your early forties?

N. Yes, I was forty-three when I got my degree. At that time and even today people would tell you, I guess, that that's too old to be taking a doctorate.

T. Well, I got mine when I was thirty-seven. The war interrupted mine, too, in a way.

N. The interesting thing was the fact that everyone told me that I was too old to go for a doctorate except Charlie Kneier and Bill Reavis at Chicago. As a matter of fact, Reavis told me, "You ought to get started. Time's a-wastin'!" So I started carrying a three-quarter load of academic studies, and about a half or three-quarter load in administrative work in visual aids.

T. When did you get your doctorate?

N. 'Forty-three, during the war. At that point, Clarence Berdahl advised me that there was an opening in the Political Science Department at Northwestern.

But I had had a lot of advice that I couldn't make a career in political science at that age. I was married; I had two children; pay wasn't good in those days. So I turned down this chance to go to Northwestern. I thought I saw a future in Extension, which was a mistake. I took over the correspondence courses and stayed on.

Then I had a call from Clarence Berdahl, saying that they needed an additional man in the Political Science Department, and asking if I was interested. Well, I took it. This was in 1944, after school had already started. I continued on annual appointment for a while, then went on as quarter-time instructor, and finally worked up to a full professorship in the Department.

T. In 1951, when I came, you were still splitting time between the Correspondence Division and Political Science.

N. I did this until '64.

T. You came full time into the Department in 1964? Had you been more than quarter time up until that point?

N. No, at this time I was already a full professor.

T. Would you say your advancement from instructor up to the associate professor level was more on the strength of your work in the Extension Division or Department of Political Science, or do you think both played a part?

N. I'd say it was due almost entirely to my work in the Department. Bob Browne had instituted some academic titles for administrative people in Extension. He offered me one and I told him I didn't want it. I rated the instructorship I held in the Political Science Department higher than a full professorship in Adult Education. So I turned that down.

T. You've essentially said that you attached a great deal more value to your services in Political Science than you did to what you were doing in Extension.

N. I very definitely did all the way through, and my work was all at the undergraduate level, up until '64. This was in part because of the nature of that fourth-time appointment. It was also due to a certain conviction that those introductory courses were really pretty important. As you well know, we have had some people come in here who did not yet have their doctorates, but who felt that they ought to be immediately assigned graduate courses—that they were too valuable to be wasted on youngsters. Perhaps because of my public school work, I had a genuine commitment to teaching basic subject matter. I thought it was important.

And then, I had developed a course in law enforcement, the Process of Law Enforcement. This had grown right out of that second course in political

science, the 151 course, which, although a "hodge-podge", was a pretty good course on the functions of government. As I had taught that, my unit on law enforcement became longer and longer until I decided to break it off separately. I had the help of David Danelski, a lawyer who was teaching constitutional law in our department. We developed that course, selected the textbook and submitted it. I got by the Department and College with it. Then the Provost sent it out to the Law School, and they rejected it. They'd had too many people in various units of the University teaching law courses. So I went out and had a good conference with John Cribbett, the Law School dean. John and I discussed the proposed course and I convinced him that there was a need for something of that type to be taught, not for pre-law students, but more or less for the general public who didn't know anything about what happened in law enforcement. He suggested some changes in the course, and then it cleared all right. I taught it for advanced undergraduates.

T. It was a 300-level course that you taught, then?

N. Yes, I'd done some substituting for Charlie Kneier in his 305, Municipal Government, which was somewhat legalistic. That's my nature also, because when you work at the state and local level, you're dealing pretty largely with powers of government and legal structures. During the 1963-64 academic year, I had asked for a transfer from Extension to the Department of Political Science.

T. The Department was expanding then. I think it was about the fall of 1965 that I came over full time from the Institute of Government at the request of Charlie Hagan. When Charlie stepped down as chairman, we got a head for the first time, and that was Vic Thompson.

N. Before that period, Murray Edelman had taken the chairmanship, held it for part of a semester, and then gave it up. It was at that point that I took over as acting chairman for a semester and two summer sessions. During the year that I was acting chairman, we had a search committee work on finding a full-time chairman. Thompson came in the fall of 1966 as head.

When I went on full time in 1964, we made a shift in introductory courses (particularly 150) from having an assistant assigned full responsibility for a section, to large lecture sessions with several assistants assigned to quiz sections. I hired all the graduate assistants assigned to the courses. I gave two of the lectures and either Phil Monypenny or Ed Lewis each had another large lecture section and several quiz sections. I had three years of those lecture sections. I cut back on one at the time I was acting chairman. So that's the story of how I came into the Department.

T. Sort of sideways, like I did. The difference was that in my case, they had asked me from time to time to teach American government in addition to my

course in public administration at the senior/graduate level. Thus, I came in at the other end of the scale and got pushed into American government occasionally. On another subject: When did you begin to publish?

N. I had started writing back when I was in the first semester of graduate work. In one course with Chadsey we had to do full research projects, and I had undertaken one on the legal status of school bonds. This was a national study of the statutes and case law of various states on the requirements for school bond issues, their characteristics, redemptions, refunding, and so on. This was back in the early 1920s. I later sold this article to an educational journal that pays for its material, the *American School Board Journal*, and they ran it serially for three issues in about 1927.

Then when I came to the Department, Clyde Snider was doing a regular feature for the *American Political Science Review* on county and other local governments; I don't think state government was involved. He brought me in as a co-editor with him on that.

T. So you had a regular contributing editorship to the *Review* with Clyde's help. I owe a lot to Clyde, too. I think he had a lot to do with bringing me here in the first place. He had been an instructor at the University of Kansas when I was a freshman there. We didn't know each other, but when we found out about it later, it proved to be quite a strong tie.

N. The chance he gave me to work with him on those articles was rather important. It helped me on general promotions. Also, my thesis, which was a legal study of the problems resulting from the changes in school district boundaries, was published just about the time that school consolidations in Illinois started.

T. The Community Unit Movement? In the late war years, this was still fairly fresh and had not been fully accepted when I got here in 1951.

N. At about that time there was a movement afoot to merge the two school districts of Champaign-Urbana: Unit 116 in Urbana and the old Number 4 in Champaign. There were public hearings on it, and a teacher had gotten up and asked what would happen to the teachers' contracts. She was told that those contracts were all null and void. So the next day I called Gene Mellon, the superintendent in Champaign. I was very much interested in this question since I had just finished my thesis.

T. The survival of these contractual arrangements in the new districts was part of your thesis?

N. Yes. Gene gave me a very airy answer: "Well, we all know that." I said, "Like hell we do, Gene." The Laramie County case was the key case.

T. For assuring the permanence of these community unit districts?

N. When you merge two districts in the absence of controlling legislation, the assets and obligations of the resulting district falls on the subsisting district. So those contracts would have to be honored. I gave him that case and about a half-dozen others. Gene was taken back a little bit on this and said, "Well, give me a letter on this." So I checked my facts. I had started the thesis under Charlie Kneier, but finished it under Clyde. I talked with both of them and they concurred that I was on the right track. So I sent a letter off to Gene Mellon. At the time of the board meeting where Gene presented this, the *Courier* was looking for something to stir up some trouble. They ran a big story, and included much of my letter.

I also wrote an article on the amenability of the governor to court processes as a national study and it turned out to be very interesting. Jack Peltason read and commented on it. I sent it to the *American Political Science Review* and they understandably weren't interested.

T. I think their interest had begun to shift from the purely legal kind of treatment of political issues.

N. They were very nasty in their reply. They made a snide crack that it was the type of thing that *perhaps* some law journal *might* be interested in. So I sent it to the *Harvard Law Journal* and got back a very nice letter saying that it didn't fit their schedule. They did indicate that there was enough interest that they were putting it on a list of articles to circulate among other journals. I got a request from the *Howard Law Review*. I sent it to them and they published it. That was a streak of luck. It came out in the '50s, just before we began to have a series of incidents of Southern governors defying the courts.

Also in the '50s—in 1959 to be exact—I completed a book on *The Government and Administration of Illinois* which was published as volume twelve of the American Commonwealth series. A short time later Charles Hagan and I collaborated on a booklet for high school use entitled *Blue Print for Our Democracy*. This went through three revisions. Anyway, my publication list was respectable, considering that I was quarter time. I had a lot of luck along with it.

That covers my technical writings. I have embarked on a product of another type, not at all for publication, but to hand down to my children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren. This is an autobiography, and my interest in it is to tell about some of the things that have changed my life and some of the really great men that I have worked with along the way.

T. Who are just a handful of those you have in your autobiographical manuscript?

N. I refer to Russell Story, for example, under whom I studied political science here at Illinois in the 1919 period. I had two political science courses under him when I was an undergraduate and he was one of the greatest teachers I have ever seen in action. I have worked with teachers professionally as a schoolman and as a student in the University. But his general personality and his ability to enlist the students' interest are among the greatest I've known. Charles Kneier was a classmate of mine in one of those courses, and I can see a lot of the characteristics of Russell Story in Charles and his methods of teaching. Story really had enthusiasm for his subject matter. During the period I was studying under him, he was a consultant for the Illinois Constitutional Convention of 1920. I enjoyed going to his office Saturday mornings when I knew he had been to Springfield. I would go on the pretext of having to talk to him about something, and spend most of the morning there with him telling me incidents about his service in Springfield.

I also studied under a man in the philosophy of education, Ned Cameron. He was a great scholar and one of the few men in education who had real stature in the University.

T. I sense behind that statement the image a lot of us have of education: that most of the people in it are involved in busy work rather than real scholarship. Is this an exception?

N. Here is a genuine exception. I would say that Dr. Cameron was respected in every area of this University for his scholarship.

There was another professor who taught educational psychology, named Kruse. I don't remember much about him beyond the fact that he was an excellent instructor. The significant thing about him was that a student in his class learned a lot about teaching by the way he taught. He knew how to develop students and anything he said from the time he entered a classroom would be of significance and have some relevance to the material he was presenting.

T. You mentioned Story in Political Science. Do you recall any others in the Department from that period?

N. Well, of course, we had a lot of giants in the Department. I never worked with Garner; he was away during the semester in which I would have had one of his courses. But I have mentioned Charlie Kneier. He and I were undergraduates together here and I was a student of his later on in the 1940s, and then we were colleagues in the Department. Charlie was a *great* teacher.

T. Of course, I didn't have him in class, but I was quite engaged by him personally.

N. I really ought to say something about John Mathews. He taught and wrote in the areas of constitutional law and American foreign policy. I had both

courses with him, incidentally. Those courses were at the 300-level. His texts were scholarly books, but they were not difficult to read. Clarity was the hallmark of those books. I actually think that despite the fact that they were scholarly books, they would have been easier to understand by most high school juniors and seniors than the stuff in social science that we give them now. They were extremely well written.

T. Did Mathews lecture from his own textbooks?

N. I would say that he did. Fairlie was a different story. He was also a great scholar. But you didn't want to put him with any undergraduates, because he was very hard to understand.

T. Yes, I have heard other people say that. I think Clarence mentions in his oral history that Fairlie was not a great or coherent lecturer.

N. By and large, we tend to look down our noses at teaching assistants. I think that is unfortunate because there are some outstanding teachers at that level. In Economics I, I had Westen, head of the Department, as a lecturer, but as a quiz instructor, I had a man named Max J. Wasserman, who was a masterful teacher. He could take any principle of economics and make it crystal clear. He had an illustration for everything. There was a degree of informality about him, but he was really a great teacher. Of course, Charlie Hagan and Francis Wilson were colleagues for whom I have much respect. They are the men who have particularly influenced me in my teaching.

Another aspect of my work for the Department was related to my connection with Extension. I did two series on the radio. These were thirty-minute lecture programs on Illinois government and on a session of the State legislature. There were about fifteen units or more in the series, which ran for a whole semester. For the program on the legislature, I didn't do a whole lot of lecturing. Rather, I brought in other people from here on campus to speak. There was somebody from the Economics Department on taxation, for example.

These were daytime programs for the most part. I had some interesting feedback on some of them from some distance around; people would comment about having heard me on the radio. These were mainly recollections of having heard me speak, they were not arguments about what I'd said.

During the period that I was full time in the Department, Monypenny and Hagan were both away. I substituted for both of them at Springfield. Around 1964, I sat in for Monypenny, along with Maude Myers, on the Civil Service Commission of the State Personnel Department. Jack Isakoff was also on that committee.

T. That concerned the re-evaluation of the personnel code, which had come under some fire at that time. Sam Gove and I had helped to write the code in

the first place in the '50s. I remember when Phil went over, but I didn't realize you had been involved in that at all.

N. Phil had been doing it and he was away for a semester. Then I sat in for Hagan in a legislative group headed by Russell Arrington. That was really a very interesting assignment, largely because of the subject matter and particularly because of the opportunity to see Arrington operate. He really knew how to run a committee.

T. The Institute of Government had a grant from the Ford Foundation to set up those legislative staff internships. You sat on the committee that helped select the interns, didn't you?

N. Yes, as I remember.

T. I think I got the applications and sent them over to the committee with some recommendations and then they screened the applications. This was in about 1964 or '65. Now, can you summarize how you feel about your connection with the Department?

N. It has been an interesting one. I haven't been as active as I probably should have been because I had this other connection. For example, I attended national meetings connected with Extension and did not get to as many political science meetings as I should have.

T. When did you retire?

N. In 1967. Of course, I was down at the University of Chattanooga on a visiting professorship in 1967-68. Then, when I came back, thinking I was absolutely through, I got called to come to Illinois State to teach two classes for one semester. After that, I was back here for one semester, pinch-hitting for Clyde. I did two classes for him—one in county government and the other in rural government.

T. What year was that?

N. It was 1970, the year of the strike. An interesting thing about that was the fact that we had almost full attendance in class during that period. This was not because of anything I was doing, but rather because the people who were taking courses of the type that Clyde offered were taking them for the subject matter. Those courses weren't the type of thing you would take just to amass some credits. I think the students were really interested.

T. I can remember that in my 361, Introduction to Public Administration, I didn't have many defections, either. One day the strikers came into class. I didn't treat them either hostilely or courteously, but I made it possible for my students to leave. I don't remember anyone leaving.

N. I had one attempt at disruption in which a chap came in and started taking over and I ordered him out. He didn't seem disposed to go. Sitting in the front row of seats there was a big guy who had been a deputy sheriff in the Indiana county in which Indianapolis is located. He got up out of his seat and said, "You heard what he said, didn't you?" and started for the student. I thought that kid was going to tear that door down getting out of there.

T. I don't think you went through a radical period in your professional development or career, did you?

N. No, I didn't. But there is something else, Tom, that is important about this period. I think that during those last years we have been talking about, we had some unfortunate placements in the Department. I am not blaming anyone. Part of it was, I think, that we had people leaving the Department, and we brought in some replacements that we didn't hold. Consequently, there was a gap between senior men and junior men. We should have had more people in that middle position.

T. We had some young people who were quite ambitious; I think it is fair to say Ranney was one of those. They chafed at the relationships and differed in their whole approach to political science from the older people. At the same time they were extremely able.

N. No question about that.

T. There were others who were not as aggressive, let's say, but who were equally able. I am thinking of Murray Edelman, for example. There is no question but that he has a brilliant and imaginative mind. . . . . .

At this point, the discussion turned to matters unrelated to political science.

History of the Public Administration Program

by Thomas Page

The selection of a person with my background and training and my gradual movement from an appointment held predominantly in the Institute of Government to a full-time commitment within the Department of Political Science tell something about the development of the public administration program at the University of Illinois.

I was a late entrant into academia. I have been called a reformed banker. But I had become a federal bureaucrat in the early days of World War II. When my draft board got too close I became a military glider pilot instructor to escape the walking army—as it turned out, a highly risky escape act. As the end of the war neared, part of my job as a political commissar (or information-education officer as the U.S. equivalent was called), was to sell the troops on the advantages of the G.I. Bill of Rights. I sold myself.

After World War II, I did my graduate training in two steps at the University of Minnesota. The first part, the Master's degree course work, was done from January through August of 1946, after which I went for two years to the University of Kansas to teach and do research on a split appointment. During that time, I finished my Master's thesis in public administration under the Minnesota program. My thesis director was Lloyd Short, who had headed that program from its inception with a large grant from the Spellman Fund one of the Rockefeller offshoots. In fact, I got the last $500 fellowship from the Spellman grant.

After my first two years at Kansas, I returned to the University of Minnesota for a fifteen-month period—from the summer of 1948 through summer 1949—and did the additional coursework and two languages and prelims for the Ph.D. in political science. I taught two more years at Kansas with a full-time appointment as an instructor in political science. The thesis for the Ph.D. was finished in the spring of 1951. I was thirty-seven years old.

In January 1951 I had talked to the University of Illinois people at a regional political science meeting. Clyde Snider had been my prime contact with the University, because at an earlier meeting we had discovered our common period at Kansas. He had been there in 1930 when I was just a freshman and he was a young instructor in political science. With that "old school tie" we

became well acquainted. When I was being considered here, Clyde had something to do with advancing my case. My appointment was to a three-quarter time research associate position in the Institute of Government, which was just then getting started, and a one-quarter time intructorship in the Department of Political Science to teach public administration. The understanding about that teaching assignment was unique because it assumed that I would teach one course on the campus one semester and then, as a regular load, one course in Springfield in the growing public administration program over there. Thus, I was really hired to strengthen that program directly out of Departmental resources. Before that time, all the teaching in Springfield had been done by Monypenny and others on extra appointments through the Extension Division. For many years I taught in Springfield as a part of my regular appointment within the Department, alternating between one Springfield course and one course on campus.

Gradually, however, the Department began to ask for more of my time from the Institute. Instead of alternating between the personnel course on campus or in Springfield or the introductory course in Springfield, I began to teach the introductory course on campus and then, before long, to add 400-level courses in administrative theory and advanced decision theory in the public administration field.

One early part of my assignment through the Institute of Government was to participate with Royden Dangerfield and Sam Gove as the technical staff for the so-called Wood Commission, named for Warren Wood who was the Republican speaker of the House. That commission was a bipartisan blue ribbon commission composed of the leadership of both houses to bring back recommendations for remodeling the civil service system for the state of Illinois, which was in bad repair. Dangerfield and I held Departmental rank—one way in which the Department was expected to reach into active public needs of the State. Three of us, Gove, James Winning, a Springfield attorney who was the parliamentarian for speaker Wood, and I did the technical drafting of the personnel code for the state of Illinois, which was introduced with the support of that blue ribbon commission, passed in 1953, and went into effect in 1955. Out of that experience came my monograph on state personnel administration in Illinois, which was published by the Institute of Government.

The Department's requests for more of my time continued. I can't give an exact chronology of how my time percentage and budget load was moved into the Department. In 1964-1965, the Department was asking for a full teaching load from me while I still had a nominally quarter-time appointment in the Institute of Government. That was unsatisfactory both to me and Gil Steiner, who by then had replaced Royden Dangerfield as director, so Steiner released me full time to the Department. Victor Thompson had been newly appointed

as head. Thompson asked me, with Monypenny's support, to take over administration of a newly strengthened M.A.P.A. in the Department, because Thompson's interest was in public administration as well. That made three of us in the field for the first time in the Department's history.

Now I turn to a history of the Program itself. My sources have included the archival documents which I preserved and turned over to James Nowlan, the present director of the Program.

Graduate instruction in Springfield through the Extension Division began even before Monypenny came here in 1947. The first candidates had been graduated before I got here in the fall of 1951. A memorandum, dated March 7, 1950, and obtained from Alice Kennedy, the first graduate of the program in Springfield, tells us what courses were offered in Springfield: In 1943-44, first semester—Public Administration by Harry K. Allen from the Department of Economics; second semester—the same. In 1944-45, first semester, two courses are listed—Problems in Personnel Administration taught by Charles Hagan and Problems in Public Administration taught by Harry K. Allen; during the second semester, the first budget course, Financial Administration of Government Agencies, was offered by Harry K. Allen who taught public finance in the Economics Department. In 1945-46 only one course was taught in the first semester by Tom Hastings—Test Construction and Administration. In 1946-47, first semester only—Legislative Processes and State, Local and Federal Government, both by Jack Isakoff, research director of the Illinois Legislative Council. In the first semester of 1947-48, Isakoff offered Problems in Public Administration; during the second semester, Phil Monypenny taught Administrative Law. This was probably Phil's second semester at Illinois. In 1948-49, both first and second semesters, Problems in State Administration was given by Robert H. Connery. In 1949-50, first semester, Public Personnel Management was taught by Paul Steinbecker from St. Louis University; second semester, Current Administrative Theory was offered by Phillips Bradley, who was then sharing a joint appointment between Political Science and the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations in its early period.

The first phase of the program, which began before I came, granted a Master of Arts in Political Science through work in Extension in Springfield. Our records show that we submitted a revised degree program to the Graduate College executive committee in November of 1954. That was one of the things which Phil Monypenny and I developed after I came here, while I was still heavily committed to the Institute of Government.

The archives contain the detailed proposal and the proposed copy for the graduate catalogue which describe the change. On March 1, 1955, it was approved by the executive faculty of the Graduate College. The Master of

Arts in Public Administration degree was approved by the Board of Trustees on April 27, 1955, on the basis of the recommendation of March 22 of the Senate committee on educational policy.

The Trustees' action provided for a program adviser in the Department appointed by the Graduate dean with the advice of the Department, plus an advisory committee composed of members from other interested departments on the campus. That advisory committee was never appointed.

The Master of Arts in Political Science in Springfield had been the only such degree available through Extension work without meeting the residence requirement. That in itself was unique. There was no other graduate degree given by the University without a residence requirement on the campus—not even, I should add, in education. That idea was continued, then, as we got approval for the Master of Arts in Public Administration, available as an on-campus degree with a residence requirement as well as an off-campus degree without a residence requirement. Phil Monypenny served as adviser for the Public Administration Program, by the nomination of the Department and the approval of the dean of the Graduate College, until February 1964. I replaced Phil at that time as the program adviser in public administration. At that point, also, the Department asked the dean of the Graduate College to relieve it of the obligation to create the inter-departmental advisory committee. I think that that was eventually confirmed without going back to the Senate and Board of Trustees. There is also a requirement in the original approval for proficiency in American "history." We called the Graduate College's attention to that as a typographical error which should have been American "government."

Details of the initial Departmental requirements for a core of courses in public administration are available in the archives: 361, Introduction to Public Administration, which Phil had taught for a long time; 368, Public Personnel Administration, the course that I was brought in to teach; and a new course in Public Fiscal Management, 367, which I introduced. The last two courses were to be offered alternately. The program approved in 1955 did not contemplate adding members to the permanent staff, but it did contemplate the increased frequency of offerings of seminars already in the catalog: particularly 465 and 466, Problems in Administrative Management and Current Administrative Theory.

Within a few years, I combined 367 and 368 into a new course, 366, Tools of Public Management, which covered personnel, budget, system analysis and a rather wide spectrum of the tool skills of public management. I cannot say to what extent these topics had been offered before I came, except that the course in public personnel administration was on the books when I got here. It is my understanding that Robert Connery, who was here for a brief period,

either introduced that course or taught it while he was on the campus, as well as in the Springfield program. At some point, 362, Administrative Organization and Policy Development, was added and first taught by Murray Edelman. At a later point, 465 and 466 were added as required seminars for the M.A.P.A.

The M.A. in Public Administration had an internship requirement, which was waived only for those people who were taking the program while they were already in the public service as mid-career candidates. Every younger person without any employment experience in the public sector was expected to complete an approved and supervised internship without unit credit. Finally, two thesis units, or two more course units plus an extended research paper, comprising a total of eight units of graduate credit, were required for the Master of Arts in Public Administration.

There were admission problems—there had been all the way along in the degree program both in Springfield and on campus—because many of the candidates who were interested in public administration, particularly those already in the career field, had backgrounds in other undergraduate programs all the way from engineering to social work to liberal arts to education. So we could not insist, as we did for the M.A. in Political Science, that candidates have a strong background in political science, as such, as undergraduates. When we found people lacking in that area, however, we asked them to do reading programs or, in some cases, actually to take preparatory work at the undergraduate level without credit.

Another problem was that many of the candidates were retooling themselves, and did not meet in their undergraduate work the 3.75 grade point average which was the standard requirement for admission into resident graduate study in the Department. Therefore we gave new people non-degree status in a great many cases until the quality of their work justified admission to full candidacy for the M.A. in Public Administration. This difficulty was not helped by a Mr. Dremuk in the Graduate Admissions Office. Dremuk would send students a form letter, without consulting me, saying their admission was denied because they lacked the admission standard. I would go to Helen Hay in the Graduate College and she had to go to Dremuk to develop a method for referring these people to me for a recommendation to the Graduate Admissions Office.

This was a messy process at best, and highly individualized. The Graduate College was barely tolerant of it and the Admissions Office, which was not under Graduate College control, was constantly interfering with it simply because of changes in personnel or in attempts to exert authority. We were always having to dicker with the Admissions Office and to explain ourselves to the Graduate College. There was a lot of administrative fumbling on the part

of other people who didn't understand the program, and a lot of highly individualized treatment of the people being admitted. This meant that the program adviser (and that eventually turned out to be me) had to develop records considerably more complete than those for other Master's and doctoral candidates, showing how some of the M.A.P.A. candidates got in the side door.

After another long struggle, students who could only spare time for half-unit registrations were not bounced back by Graduate Admissions. The direction of the program was also finally recognized by the Graduate College.

At another point, the Graduate College objected to the extension of time for the completion of the degree for a couple of candidates who had not, because of rapid promotions, been able to maintain continuous course work. These extensions were for greater than the stipulated total period of seven years. One notable case was that of Steven Sargent, who had taken over from his father as executive director of the Illinois Municipal League, and had come back to get the professional credentials that would help him in his focal role in lobbying for the municipal governments in the state. Another was Harry Cruse, who had been promoted rapidly within the Illinois Department of Personnel and was the head of their Division of Classification and Examination. He, too, had had to drop out. Both wanted back in.

We got a long, agonized response from the Graduate College saying that they wished we wouldn't do this but that they would be willing to back away from their denial of readmission if we would just change the title of the degree from Master of Arts in Public Administration to Master of Public Administration. This would allow them to recognize the degree as terminal and professional and, by implication, less than scholarly, so we could do as we pleased. It was all bureaucratic nonsense from Stanton Millett, then associate dean of the Graduate College in 1966. Both of those men (Sargent and Cruse) went on to complete their degrees with perfectly respectable thesis work.

Another objection we got when we had to tailor things individually concerned several candidates on campus in 1973. Again, because of the pressures on their careers, they were forced to drop out and not register for courses in every succeeding semester. In March of '73, I had to make an argument to get leaves of absence, in effect, for which the Graduate College simply didn't have any provision. Three of the four people who were granted leaves of absence came back and completed very good degree programs. One of them simply ran out of money and couldn't finish, but that is a pretty good score on that kind of arrangement.

In addition, once the graduate records were computerized, a great many of the M.A.P.A. candidates, both on and off campus, were assigned a code number for graduate candidacy as if they were candidates for the M.A. in

Political Science. In one computer error we lost most of the apparent candidates for the M.A. in Public Administration. It took literally three years to get all of these errors corrected. We would send over notes to get them corrected, but these didn't accomplish anything. The students showed up on the wrong list for several succeeding semesters. Several times we simply had to submit a complete inventory from our records in order to get the Graduate College to correct the computer. There are memoranda in the file from me to the Graduate College and to the Office of Admissions and Records which were, in effect, *treaties* to make it possible for us to continue to do business in the flexible way that was necessary with this out-of-the-ordinary program.

Another interesting aspect of the Springfield program is revealed by the bulletin issued in August 1967 announcing the offerings for the coming semester in Springfield. One course listed was Political Science E312, State Government, taught by Professor Donald P. Brown from the Political Science Department of Illinois Wesleyan University in Bloomington. This was typical of the kind of borrowing we had to do to keep the program going, either from other departments on our campus—Sociology, Labor and Industrial Relations, Economics—or from other universities.

Eventually, as the program in Springfield was nearing its end, or rather, was at what we found to be a transitional point, we borrowed Professor Robert Batson, who had been hired by Illinois State University at Normal to teach public administration. Batson began to teach under extramural contract in our Springfield program. Then, as our Springfield program phased over to control by Sangamon State, he moved from Normal to the new university at Springfield and became the director there of the program in which he had already taught under our direction. This made a very smooth transition. He already knew most of the people in the program by the time he took over the administration of it.

Another course which we intended to offer that fall of 1967 was one which had been offered intermittently before, Sociology E318, Industry and Society, by Professor Bernard Karsh. We discovered after we had announced this, that the Business School had pre-empted all the spaces in the Karsh course for a short-lived promotion by Dean Paul Green. That was the so-called Central Illinois Graduate Council, which was going to do management training for business groups at the graduate level without a residence requirement, just as we were doing it for public service groups. The business program sank without a trace soon afterward but that capture of one of our standard offerings didn't endear Dean Green to me.

The bulletin describing the spring 1969 courses in Springfield notes that Labor and Industrial Relations E442, Collective Bargaining in the Public Sector, would be taught by Professor Martin Wagner, who had just stepped

down as the director of the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations. He was one of our most powerful teachers over there because he had been chairman of the Illinois Civil Service Commission. He knew a great deal about the Illinois public sector and he had been a chairman of Governor Kerner's advisory commission on labor-management policy for public employees. The other course offered that spring was E362, Public Administration and Policy Development, taught by Robert Batson.

We have the bulletin for the fall of 1969 in which one of the courses listed was Political Science E356, Public Administration and Judicial Process, our course in administrative law which I was able to offer only at long intervals. It was taught by James M. Winning, the Springfield attorney mentioned earlier, who had participated with Sam Gove and me in drafting the personnel code. The second course was my Political Science E366, Tools of Public Management.

We had some interesting troubles getting 366 approved during that difficult period with Dean Green. I have the archival file on the development of the course, which was proposed in January 1962 to the Graduate College. It ran into criticism, particularly from the Business School which was headed by Dean Green at the time, and the Engineering College. Business objected that we were proposing to deal with management analysis tools and they were already doing that. Engineering was also involved in some kinds of system analysis approaches. Of course, we were in a pretty strong position by proposing 366 and simultaneously dropping two other courses. Our proposal to the Graduate College, however, bounced back from the committee on courses and curriculum after objections by both the Business and Engineering Schools. From April 1962 we have in the files an explanation and defense of that new course, signed by Chairman Charles Hagan but written by me, which successfully headed off the objections that were raised by the two other colleges—a footnote on the politics of academe.

One further sidelight on the history of the Public Administration Program involves the transfer of our extramural Master of Arts in Public Administration degree at Springfield to the new Sangamon State University. On May 18, 1970, the dean of the Graduate College confirmed to the president of Sangamon State the details of the agreement I had engineered between Sangamon State and the University of Illinois for the transition to the new scheme. The agreement granted approval for students with more than three units completed in our extramural program in Springfield to choose either to continue with the University of Illinois by taking courses given in residence here, or to accept courses given by Sangamon toward the degree here at the U of I. People with fewer than three units could only continue the degree program at Sangamon State. Most of the people who were in the first two categories chose to continue the program by meeting our degree

requirements. There were twenty-one of those candidates at the time of transition. My records showed that eight of them had thesis units in progress, seven more had six units completed, and six had three or more units. All or nearly all of them completed the degree here. There were at that time thirty-three candidates in the third category with limited standing. Three of them had three or more units and might have continued here, but I don't think any of them did. Thirty candidates had less than three units and all of them were eligible to transfer to Sangamon.

This transition, made under the administration of Professor Batson, was a very smooth one. Moreover, we did not look on the transition of our Springfield program as a loss. The resident degree program was expanding both in the number of degree candidates on campus and in the registrations in public administration courses from other departments, including Business and Education.

In 1969, we got a grant, routed through the Institute of Government and Public Affairs, from the Illinois Department of Local Government Affairs. The grant was for some urban fellows. We advertised and recruited some minority candidates on that basis. It was initially given to us on a one-year basis, but was renewed for two years. In addition, we made a later attempt to get a grant through the Board of Higher Education for some Title VIII federal money under the Housing Act, also to be used for graduate training for urban fellows. We did not get that federally funded assistance. A look at the fellows that we had under the Illinois grant, however, and at what they did later in their careers, indicates that the State made an extremely wise investment, even though the candidates didn't remain in the State. We brought in some excellent black candidates, one of whom returned to complete a doctorate with us.

During the late sixties and early seventies we admitted a succession of young Japanese civil servants, rigorously selected and supported by their National Personnel Agency after their first few years of service in Japan. They came from backgrounds and agencies as varied as nuclear engineering and postal administration. By 1982, three of them had served as the career secretaries to their respective political cabinet ministers, three had served (one presently) as second secretaries to the Japanese Embassy in Washington, and one had served on the Japanese delegation to EURATOM in Paris. My wife and I were the guests of seven of them during a visit to Japan in 1974 after my retirement.

When I took over the administration of the Program in April 1965, I made a general outline of our status and authority under the Graduate College, our admission requirements in the available fields of study, the internship and thesis requirements, and the requirements for final oral examinations for the M.A. in Public Administration. I also described the placement efforts which

we undertook to put our candidates in good jobs and admitted the fact that we had very few fellowships or assistantships awarded to the M.A.P.A. Program unless they were funded by the separate urban fellowship grants reserved for black candidates. The M.A.P.A. program was, in effect, a poor relation within the general area of political science, both in its staffing and recognition and in support for its graduate candidates.

The few candidates who were doing Ph.D. degrees with emphasis in public administration also felt that they had to struggle against a lack of recognition. I can recall four of them who particularly felt that resentment. Two of them were foreign students; two were American students. Only one of them really escaped from the difficulties that this sense of low status imposed.

One of the useful archival files is entitled "M.A.P.A. Program Evaluation." We didn't get much evaluation of the program. It was viewed to a significant degree by others in the Department as a rather eccentric hobby of Monypenny and Page. It was tolerated as long as resources were not too tight. In October 1972, while Betty Glad was acting head, however, the Department was asked for the first time to do an across-the-board evaluation of all of its activities. There is a document in the file prepared by me, as the program adviser, which comments in considerable depth on the activities of the program and on the problems in its continuing administration. In rank order, the problems were seen as (1) inadequate graduate faculty to meet the minimum service demands of the students; (2) the lack of separate minimum allocation of financial assistance in order to attract promising candidates; (3) the difficulty in maintaining faculty research productivity when the combined teaching and advising loads for the candidates fell heavily on one member and, to a minor extent, on one other; and (4) the low organizational visibility of the M.A.P.A. unit within the Department. Still other program deficiencies, shortcomings and problems were listed. This was a critical analysis from within the Program which then became a part of a November 1972 analysis of the Department's problems as a whole.

During the time Victor Thompson was head of the Department, he brought a bit of prestige to the field of public administration, and made a collaborative effort with the Departments of Business Administration and Psychology to develop an organizational science degree program leading to the Ph.D. The effort was made to add it as a sixth field for the Ph.D. candidates in political science, there being five others listed in the catalogue. A sample program proposal was circulated and an introductory proseminar for people in both business administration and public administration was instituted as a meeting place for both teachers who were interested in this and students who were taking the combined program. The program never really got off the ground although the proseminar was conducted for two years. There was never any

central planning; each separate professor participating in the program would come in and talk about his own particular research, and it was left entirely to the students to provide whatever linkage or co-ordination or common understanding might have been developed from this proseminar. Thompson eventually lost interest in it, as he lost interest in a good many things other than his own individual research. It totally disappeared when Thompson abruptly resigned from the University to go to Florida.

In spite of that uneven treatment, if we look back over the entire list of graduates with an M.A. or M.A.P.A. degree, the program has had a profound influence on the character of administration in Illinois state government. It has supplied a notable number of career-oriented people to the fields of municipal management as well as professional association administration, and it has given supporting credentials to people in a wide range of fields from social welfare to police administration to educational administration. We supplied the basic conceptual work in administrative theory that was not available at the same level in the other more professionally oriented departments.

I am thoroughly enjoying retirement. Since I retired in 1974, I have served on the Urbana Civil Service Commission, so I have an active sense that I am doing business in the same field in which I started here in Illinois. Only recently, my term as the appointee of a succession of Illinois governors to the Advisory Board of the Illinois Department of Personnel has expired after over two decades of service. I created that body out of my head when I was helping to draft a new personnel code for the state in 1953.

I am pleased to see the strengthening of support for the Public Administration Program here at the University and in the Department. It is quite clear that the demand for the field is strong and growing.